

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR

CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

JANUARY, 1880 APRIL, 1880.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CLI.

LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER, LONDON.

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1880.

LONDON : PRINTED BY
JITTSWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

CONTENTS OF No. 309.

	Page
ART. I.—1. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, July 4, 1879. Debate on Mr. Chaplin's Motion for the Appointment of a Royal Commission to enquire into the depressed Condition of the Agricultural Interest.	
2. The Agricultural Situation. A Speech of the Right Hon. Earl of Beaconsfield at Aylesbury, September 18, 1879.	
3. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the Improvement of Land. 1873.	
4. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Land Titles and Transfer. 1879.	
5. Reports from H.M. Representatives respecting the Tenure of Land in the several Countries of Europe. 1869–1870.	
6. The Landed Interest and the Supply of Food. By James Caird, C.B., F.R.S. London: 1878.	
7. Free Trade in Land. By Joseph Kay, M.A., Q.C. London: 1879.	
8. The Corn and Cattle producing Districts of France. By George Gibson Richardson. 8vo. London: 1877.	
9. Reports on the Manufacture, Commerce, &c., of the United States of America. By Victor A. W. Drummond. Parliamentary Papers, Commercial (Trade Reports). Nos. 14 and 20. 1879,	1
II.—The Life of J. M. W. Turner, R.A. By Philip Gilbert Hamerton. London: 1879,	10
III.—1. England and Russia in Central Asia. By Demetrius C. Boulger. With a fac-simile of the Russian Military Map of Central Asia. Two volumes. London: 1879.	
2. Relations between the British Government and that of Afghanistan. Parliamentary Paper. 1878.	
3. The Strategical Conditions of our Indian North-West Frontier. By Major-General E. B. Hamley, C.B., R.A. London: 1878,	68

- IV.—New Ireland. By A. M. Sullivan. Sixth Edition.
London and Dublin: 1878, 99
- V.—1. The Miracle Play of Hasan and Husain, collected
from Oral Tradition by Colonel Sir Lewis Pelly,
K.C.B., K.C.S.I. Revised, with Explanatory Notes,
by Arthur N. Wollaston. In Two Volumes. London:
1879.
2. Théâtre Persan. Par Alexandre Chodźko. Paris:
Bibliothèque Orientale Elzévirienne. 1878.
3. Les Religions et les Philosophies en Asie. Par
Joseph, Comte de Gobineau. Paris: 1865, . . . 141
- VI.—1. A Description and List of the Lighthouses of the
World. Nineteenth Edition. By Alexander George
Findlay, F.R.G.S. London: 1879.
2. Life of Robert Stevenson, Civil Engineer. By David
Stevenson, C.E. London: 1878.
3. International Associations for the Maintenance of Sea
Lights. By Sir Travers Twiss, D.C.L., 172
- VII.—Russia before and after the War. By the author of
'Society in St. Petersburg.' Translated from the
German by Edward Fairfax Taylor. 8vo. London:
1880, 206
- VIII.—Life and Letters of Gilbert Elliot, First Earl of
Minto, from 1807 to 1814, while Governor-General
of India. Being a Sequel to his 'Life and Letters,'
published in 1874. Edited by his Great-Niece, the
Countess of Minto. London: 1880, 228
- IX.—1. Political Studies. By the Honourable George C.
Brodrick. 8vo. London: 1879.
2. England. By Mr. T. S. Escott. 2 vols. 8vo.
London: 1879.
3. Essays on Finance. By Robert Giffen. 8vo. Lon-
don: 1879, 257

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JANUARY, 1880.

No. CCCIX.

- ART. I.—1. *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, July 4, 1879.
Debate on Mr. Chaplin's Motion for the Appointment of
a Royal Commission to enquire into the Depressed Con-
dition of the Agricultural Interest.
2. *The Agricultural Situation*. A Speech of the Right Hon.
Earl of BEACONSFIELD at Aylesbury, September 18, 1879.
3. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on
the Improvement of Land*. 1873.
4. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons
on Land Titles and Transfer*. 1879.
5. *Reports from H.M. Representatives respecting the Tenure of
Land in the several Countries of Europe*. 1869–1870.
6. *The Landed Interest and the Supply of Food*. By JAMES
CAIRD, C.B., F.R.S. London: 1878.
7. *Free Trade in Land*. By JOSEPH KAY, M.A., Q.C.
London: 1879.
8. *The Corn- and Cattle-producing Districts of France*. By
GEORGE GIBSON RICHARDSON. 8vo. London: 1877.
9. *Reports on the Manufacture, Commerce, &c., of the United
States of America*. By VICTOR A. W. DRUMMOND. Par-
liamentary Papers, Commercial (Trade Reports). (Nos.
14 and 20.) 1879.

THE agriculture of this country is, at the present time,
passing through a crisis of almost unprecedented severity.
Owners and occupiers of land are anxiously enquiring whether
the causes to which this crisis is due are of a permanent

VOL. CII. NO. CCCIX. B

or of a transitory character; whether they are natural causes over which we have no control, or whether they can be met by legislative or other measures. Many different answers have been given to these important questions. Doctors are not wanting to prescribe remedies; but among them there is the proverbial difference of opinion, both as to diagnosis and treatment. Some attribute the disease to the aggregation of large estates, and to inherent vices in our land system, and would apply a more or less drastic treatment to the laws which regulate the possession and occupation of land; some have discovered in the existing relations of landlord and tenant the cause of the evil, and would amend those relations in a manner generally favourable to the tenant; others again have the bugbear of foreign competition constantly before their eyes, and, though they cannot seriously hope for a return to protection, grasp at the shadows of the past, and express futile and unavailing regrets that it was ever abandoned. All, however, admit that a succession of unusually deficient harvests, aggravated by low prices, is the proximate cause of the depression which undoubtedly weighs on the agricultural interest.

The Royal Commission appointed last summer will have to pronounce an authoritative opinion on these and other points. We are not sanguine enough to anticipate any important practical results from their investigations; but a vast amount of information will be accumulated by them, and the report based on this information will doubtless be a document of great interest and value. A considerable period of time must, however, elapse before this report can see the light of day; and as the subjects with which it will deal are of immediate and pressing interest, we make no apology for endeavouring to form some opinion upon them.

We propose to discuss them in the following order:—

1. The causes of the agricultural depression, and the manner in which they have affected landowners, tenants, and labourers.

2. Foreign competition.

3. The land laws and their results, (1) as to the accumulation or distribution of estates, and (2) as to the permanent improvement of land.

4. The relation of tenants to their landlords, and the effects of these relations on the cultivation of the soil.

Of the three classes whom Lord Beaconsfield represents as making three profits out of the land, the labourers have of late prospered; the landowners, on whom, if matters do not improve, the main loss must ultimately fall, have their incomes

curtailed by remissions of rent, and, in some counties, many of their farms tenantless; but as yet the farmers have been the heaviest losers.

Agriculture has, during the present century, passed through more than one severe crisis, and on each of those occasions the labourers' question caused the gravest anxiety; pauperism increased to an alarming extent; the poor rates equalled, and in some cases even exceeded, the rent of the land; and the condition of the labouring classes was to the last degree miserable. This is, happily, no longer the case; poor rates have not risen, and pauperism has increased but little, in the agricultural counties. Mr. Caird is undoubtedly right when he says that 'the general condition of the agricultural labourer' probably was never better than it is at present.' About seven years ago various circumstances, which it is unnecessary to specify, caused a rise in the rate of agricultural wages to the extent of at least two shillings a week, and they have not subsequently fallen concurrently with profits. They may have dropped a little in the last few months, but they still maintain a high level. Moreover, the cost of the labourer's living has generally decreased. The rapid development of foreign trade has, in spite of the deficient harvests, kept down the price of corn to the injury of the producer, but to the immense advantage of the consumer. Comparing the rate of wages with the price of bread, it appears that the weekly wages in 1770 were 7s. 3d., while bread was 1½d. per pound; in 1850, immediately after the repeal of the Corn Laws, wages had risen to 9s. 7d., and bread was selling for 1¼d. per pound; last year wages had risen, on an average, to 14s. a week, the price of bread being exactly the same as it was a hundred years ago. So that the labourer can earn as much bread by half a week's work now as he could then by a whole week's work. Almost all the articles which he habitually uses and consumes, with the exception of butcher's meat, have diminished in price; and if he refrains from tobacco and alcoholic liquors he is practically exempt from all taxation except on tea and coffee. It is true that the price of bread and of other articles of food has advanced during the last few months, and some distress may therefore be anticipated for the poorer classes during the winter; but it does not seem probable that the demand for agricultural labour will be seriously diminished, or that there will be a material reduction in the rate of wages.

We cannot but rejoice at this state of things, though the employer of labour may not regard it in the same light; to him it means increased cost of production and consequent

decrease of profits, unless the increased efficiency of the labourer compensates for the rise of his wages. Low wages do not imply cheap labour; the northern 'hind' who earns 20s. a week is worth a great deal more to his employer than the southern labourer who earns his 13s. to 14s. But there is a general complaint that farm labour has deteriorated in quality. It is difficult, in some districts almost impossible, to obtain efficient and trustworthy men to fill the more responsible positions on a farm. There are now more careers open to young men than there were some years ago, and they are more apt to take advantage of them. The smartest and most active lads of the village, who would formerly have had no ideas beyond the plough or the team, now emigrate to the United States or to the colonies; or if they remain at home, they find more remunerative employment in the public service or in the towns. The least efficient hands are, as a rule, left to the farmer, and he has to pay them higher wages than at any former period.

Passing from the labourer to his employers, we find them in a far less satisfactory condition. The symptoms of the distress, which prevails with more or less intensity throughout the country, are obvious to the most superficial observer. Rents have been remitted to the extent of ten, twenty, and even fifty per cent.; and, in spite of these remissions, numbers of farms have been vacated, and there are no applicants for them at any price. The agricultural returns for the present year show a decrease of 1,986 in the number of occupiers, and 'this decrease, in some cases, is stated to be 'caused by the number of farms now in the hands of the 'owners owing to the depression, and returned by the owner 'as one holding.'

The farmer's accounts rarely, if ever, stood so low in the county banks; and it is to be feared that not a few unfortunate men have fallen into the hands of usurers, who frequent the country towns and advance loans on bills of sale executed by farmers at an exorbitant rate of interest. Upwards of six hundred bills of sale were executed during three or four months last autumn.

Statisticians have been occupied in estimating the losses of agriculturists. But, without following them through all their elaborate calculations, a brief examination of the agricultural records for the last few years will sufficiently indicate the extent and causes of these losses. The results of the wheat crops for the last nine years are given in the following table, for which we are mainly indebted to a 'Statist's' interesting letter to the 'Times' (July 14, 1879). We have added an es-

timate of the last crop, which is necessarily of a somewhat speculative character. The last column, which gives the farmer's gross returns in money for an acre of wheat, is arrived at by multiplying the price in column 4 by the yield in column 3. The second column is taken from Mr. Caird's 'Landed Interest.'—

	Area of United Kingdom under Wheat Crops	Average Production per Acre as compared with standard of 100	Production of Wheat per Acre	Average Price per Quarter during 12 months preceding harvest		Average Gross Produce for Wheat, represented in Money, excluding value of Straw		
	Acres.		Qrs.	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1871	3,831,000	90	3·2	56	7	9	1	1
1872	3,840,000	92	3·2	57	3	9	3	2
1873	3,670,000	80	2·8	61	3	8	11	6
1874	3,833,000	106	3·7	44	7	8	4	11
1875	3,514,000	78	2·7	46	9	6	4	2
1876	3,124,000	76	2·7	54	8	7	7	7
1877	3,321,000	74	2·6	50	10	6	12	2
1878	3,382,000	108	3·8	40	5	7	13	7
1879	3,056,000	70?	2·2?	48	9?	5	9	8?

This table shows, in the first place, that the wheat-growing area has in six years been diminished by nearly 800,000 acres, or one-fourth of the whole. It further shows that during the last nine years we have only had two crops at or over the average. The yield of four out of the five last harvests has been more than 20 per cent. below the average; only on four occasions since 1849 has the yield of wheat been so deficient, and those occasions were separated from one another by intervals of abundance. In no year probably since 1816 has there been so bad a crop as the last. This alone is sufficient to account for much distress, but this is not all. In former years the loss which resulted from a deficiency was to a great extent made up to the producer by enhanced prices. After the bad harvests of 1852-3 the price of wheat rose to 72s. per quarter; in 1868 it stood at 68s. During the six years from 1872 to 1878, in spite of the deficient yield, prices have ruled abnormally low, the average price being 49s. 7d. per quarter. If we multiply the price of wheat by the yield per acre, the product will represent in money the farmer's gross return per acre, excluding the value of the straw. Taking the six years

from 1872 to 1878, his average gross return amounts to 7*l.* 9*s.* per acre, 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* less than the average of the five years ending 1870–71, and 1*l.* 18*s.* less than the average of twenty-four years ending 1873. Last year's harvest is excluded from this calculation; if it could have been included, the results would be still more unfortunate. The yield cannot be estimated at more than 18 bushels per acre, and if it makes 48*s.* 9*d.* per quarter, which is the average price of the last five years, it will only realise 5*l.* 9*s.* 8*d.* per acre, or 2*l.* less than the wretched yield of the preceding six years. Moreover, last year's wheat is as deficient in quality as in quantity. In a letter to the 'Economist' of November 15, 1879, Mr. J. B. Lawes makes the following significant statement:—

'In 1863, which is the year in which I commenced to give an annual report and estimate of the wheat crop, the mean produce of the three artificially manured plots was 55 bushels per acre, with an average weight per bushel of 62½ lbs. In 1879 the very same manures have given an average of only 19½ bushels, at 53½ lbs. per bushel, equal to only 16½ bushels at the same weight per bushel as in 1863. We have here a striking illustration of how great is the influence on the result of the farmer's efforts of circumstances entirely beyond his control, after he has employed all the resources at his command to obtain a good crop.'

The barley and oat crops, which together occupy about 7,000,000 acres of the United Kingdom, more than double the area of wheat, have for the last six years been at least one quarter per acre below the average of the preceding twenty-four years, and, though their prices have not fallen to the same extent as that of wheat, the farmer's gross return per acre has been very considerably reduced.

Turning from corn to cattle, we have a very different story to tell. A Parliamentary return, recently issued, shows that the price of butcher's meat has risen very rapidly, especially during the last six or eight years. Taking the same period as above, we arrive at the following results:—

Average Price of Butcher's Meat per Stone of 8 lbs. (sinking Offal).

	Beasts		Sheep		Milk
	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	Per Gallon
1849–1866	3	10½	4	4	0 9½
1866–1872	4	9½	5	2	1 0
1872–1878	5	4½	6	0	1 3

Therefore, as regards meat, and to a less extent milk, the

producer's position has rapidly improved. During this winter, however, he will have considerable difficulties to encounter, for his stock of food for cattle is lamentably deficient. Last year's crop of roots was as bad as that of wheat; the roots themselves were small and badly grown; and the wet season, which impeded their growth, stimulated that of weeds, and at the same time prevented the farmer from taking measures to destroy them. The hay crop, which in the two previous years was remarkably good, was in many places utterly ruined, and everywhere it was saved in bad condition.

To form a true opinion of the tenant farmer's position, we must further observe that not only have his returns decreased, but his expenses have increased. The price of labour, to which we have already referred, the cost of manures and machinery, the amount of his tradesmen's bills, have all gone up; and where leases were renewed during the prosperous period which preceded 1874 they were in most cases readjusted to the advantage of the owners.

The inferences which are to be drawn from these figures are: First, that the unprecedented succession of deficient crops, accompanied as they have been by low prices, is quite sufficient to account for the agricultural depression, without introducing any more abstruse causes; and secondly, that the distress is very unevenly distributed. The corn-growing farmers, especially on heavy clay lands, have suffered most severely; breeders of cattle and grazing farmers, though they have in many cases been injured, are, comparatively speaking, fortunate. An exception must, however, even here be made of the cheese districts, the inferior qualities of cheese having, till quite recently, been greatly depreciated in value by American competition.

As regards the landowners, rents must ultimately be re-adjusted by competition, and if the profits derived from the cultivation of the soil are permanently diminished, rents must be proportionally reduced. In the present uncertain and anomalous circumstances there is no standard of value to guide us. Landlords would act wisely in making such allowances as each individual case seems to require, or, still better, in supplying their tenants with manures or artificial food to enable them to keep their holdings well stocked during the winter. The wholesale remissions of rent, irrespective of the varying conditions of different estates or farms, appear to us neither just nor reasonable. The landowners may, however, be comforted by the consideration that land is the one kind of property which admits of no increase, and that the accumula-

tion of capital in the country will increase the competition for it.

The question of prices leads us to the second part of our subject—foreign competition, and its effects on the home production. The low price of wheat may be due, to a certain extent, to the reduced demand caused by the stagnation of trade, but to a far greater degree it is owing to the enormous supplies which we have received from America. In 1821 the average production of corn in the United Kingdom was about equal to the consumption. Since that time the population has doubled, but the production of corn has apparently not increased. Our annual consumption now amounts in round numbers to 24,000,000 quarters. Mr. Caird, in his interesting chapter on ‘The Home and Foreign Supply of Food,’ estimates that one-half of this amount is imported, and this is not an incorrect estimate if we take the average of the last nine or ten years; but since 1874 our home supplies have fallen off considerably, in consequence of the unfavourable seasons and the reduction of the wheat-growing area, while our foreign importations have proportionately increased; till in the present year, if the estimates, which calculate the produce of the last harvest at 6,000,000 quarters, are fairly accurate, we shall have to import no less than three times the amount of our home production, or 3,500,000 quarters more than we have imported in any previous year. By far the largest proportion of our foreign supplies of bread stuffs is derived from the North American continent; in 1878, out of a total importation of 60,000,000 cwt., no less than 36,000,000 cwt. were from the United States and Canada, which is more than double the amount received from those countries nine years ago. The importation of barley and oats, which represents a value of about 11,000,000*l.*, has not materially increased.

It is not, however, only in the production of corn that our farmers are exposed to competition; even in the meat market they are no longer free from rivals. It was clear that, if the difficulties of transport could be surmounted, the high price obtainable in England would render the meat trade a very remunerative business; a pound weight of meat being much more valuable than a pound of corn, it would obviously cover the cost of carriage for a much longer distance. The discovery that meat can be kept fresh during the voyage across the Atlantic, by passing currents of air cooled by ice over it, has created an entirely new trade, which has been developed with extraordinary rapidity. It commenced in the year 1876, when the value of the fresh meat exported from the United States was

349,100 dollars; two years later the exportation amounted to 54,046,771 lbs., and is valued at 5,009,856 dollars, almost the whole of this amount having been shipped to this country. The trade in live animals has been no less flourishing; the whole exportation from the United States increased eightfold between 1868 and 1878; and, in spite of the existing restrictions, the value of the cattle imported into the United Kingdom rose from 2,408,843 dollars in the fiscal year, 1878, to 6,616,114 dollars in 1879. We have annually been in the habit of importing animals from European countries, and from America we have received large quantities of bacon, ham, and salt provisions; but the trade which has recently sprung into existence with that country in fresh meat and live animals has caused something like a panic among the home producers. In the cheese districts also farmers are no less alarmed at the success with which the large factories, recently established in America, have been able to undersell the produce of their dairies. The tables annexed to the *Agricultural Returns* for 1879 enable us to trace the development of the trade in articles of food for the last twenty years. By comparing the imports of 1868 with those of 1878, the following results are obtained:—

	1868	1878
1. Live Cattle, Sheep, and Pigs	£2,698,511	£7,453,309
2. Corn, Grain, and Flour .	49,432,624	59,064,875
3. Dead Meat and Provisions .	13,277,683	29,478,065
	£55,408,803	£95,996,249
Population	30,617,718	33,799,386
Value per Head of Population .	£1 16s. 2d.	£2-16s. 10d.

During this period of ten years, in which the foreign food supplies increased in such a remarkable manner, the agricultural production at home has remained stationary, the area under the different crops has scarcely varied in extent, and the live stock has slightly diminished in number. Mr. Caird, in the chapter to which we have already referred, tells us: 'The country derives from foreign lands not only one-half of its bread, and nearly one-fourth of its meat and dairy produce, but must also depend on the foreigner for almost the entire

‘addition that may be further required by an increase of its ‘population.’

Can the agriculture of this country stand against the annually increasing pressure of foreign competition? Is it probable that wheat, and even meat, will be produced abroad and sold here at prices which would leave the home producer no margin for profits? In discussing these questions we may confine our attention to America. Mr. Victor Drummond’s report, and two letters which he addressed to the ‘Daily News’ last autumn, furnish us with the most trustworthy information on this subject. The wheat-producing area of the United States is put at 30,000,000 acres; but large as this area is, it is insignificant compared with the capacity of the North-Western States and the province of Manitoba. On the banks of the Red River of the North, and of the two Saskatchewan, lie more than 200,000,000 acres of wheat-producing prairie. The main impediment to the settlement of this vast district has hitherto been the want of means of transporting the produce; these difficulties are being rapidly surmounted by the extension of railways and by improvements in the water-carriage. If the navigation of the Nelson river, which flows from Lake Winipeg into the Hudson Bay, prove satisfactory, almost continuous water communication will be opened with the ‘fertile belt’ in the Saskatchewan valleys. The area of fertile prairie may therefore be regarded as limitless, and the rapidity with which it is being developed is truly marvellous. The land sales of the Government increased from 3,338,000 acres in the year ending January 30, 1878, to 7,562,000 acres in the following year; and the sales by the State land agencies and the railway offices have increased in like proportion. It is estimated that no less than 20,000,000 acres were newly settled in 1878, and at least half a million persons have within the same period changed their abodes and occupations. This unparalleled agricultural development is affecting other nations besides ourselves. It threatens the Russian trade; and it has already had a most injurious effect on the older cultivation of the Atlantic States, where the value of agricultural land has suffered a material depreciation.

A combination of exceptional circumstances has recently given an impetus to this Western exodus. The depression, which for a considerable period weighed heavily on the trade of the United States, induced many of those who were engaged in it, or who were thrown out of employment, to seek their fortunes in the far West. At the same time the Eastern railways, having their mineral traffic diminished, were content

to carry grain at the lowest possible rates; and the Western lines, which had been pushed on by speculators in the previous times of inflation, were willing to give the most liberal terms to the farmers, in order to encourage settlers to buy the land which the State had allotted to them. The abundant harvests of 1878-79, and the increased European demand, secured the prosperity of the new settlers, and encouraged others to follow their lead.

The settler has no rent, tithes, or poor-rate to pay, and his taxes bear no comparison with the charges on land in this country. The virgin soil which he cultivates requires no outlay in manures; though it is obvious that without the use of restoratives the power of yielding abundant crops must in a series of years be materially impaired, as has proved to be the case in California, in Illinois, in Ohio, and other States. The average yield per acre does not exceed 13 bushels, though in some of the new lands it attains, during the first few years, to 20 or 25 bushels. The land being limitless in extent, its exhaustion is a matter of small importance; and it pays better to obtain what yield the natural fertility of the soil will give, than to stimulate it to increased productiveness by artificial means.

Emigrants have, under the Homestead Acts of Canada and the United States, the greatest facilities for acquiring farms at a low rate. In the United States the size of farms is limited to 160 acres, for which the settler would have to pay about 4*l.* 5*s.* in fees and other expenses. In Canada he may obtain a free grant of the same amount of land, with certain powers of buying the contiguous blocks or 'quarter sections' at the rate of 1 dollar per acre. In other cases the value of land mainly depends on its proximity to a railway; but we may generally reckon that it fetches from 16*s.* to 30*s.* an acre.

The land having been purchased has to be brought into cultivation, implements and horses have to be bought, and a house and stables to be erected. Several estimates have been given of these preliminary expenses, which vary somewhat in amount, but they cannot be put at less than from 2*l.* to 2*l.* 10*s.* per acre. Supposing, then, a settler to purchase 160 acres of land at the rate of 1*l.* per acre, his outlay of capital would, in the first instance, amount to at least 480*l.* His annual expenses of cultivation, including seed, ploughing, reaping, and threshing, it is stated, amount to 28*s.* per acre, and, adding 6*s.* for interest on a capital of 480*l.* at 10 per cent., we arrive at 1*l.* 14*s.* as the annual cost for an acre, which will yield, on an average, 13 to 15 bushels. If this calculation is correct, to pay

the cultivator 8s. per acre as profit, in addition to the interest on his capital, the crop must be sold for at least 3s. per bushel.

The cost of transport to this country has now to be considered. Mr. Drummond, in his report, states that

‘during the year 1866 the average rate for the carriage of wheat from Chicago to New York by Lake and Erie Canal was a little over 27 cents per bushel; but during the year 1878, by the same route, the average rate was 7½ cents, and by all rail 12 cents. During the present year the average cost of transporting wheat from the region of the Red River of the North, in the northern part of the State of Minnesota, to the city of New York, has been only 26 cents per bushel.

Taking the price for wheat in the Western States approximately as 3s. 7d., and adding to this 1s. for cost of transport to New York, we obtain 4s. 8d., which was the average price of wheat at that port during six months of last year. The freight from New York to Liverpool amounts to 6d. per bushel, which brings the price up to 5s. 2d. per bushel, or 41s. 4d. per quarter, which was the average price at Liverpool. Mr. Caird calculates that the cost of freight is about equivalent to the rent paid by English farmers, and if our own figures are correct it would amount to 17. 10s. for 20 bushels, which is considerably less than the average yield of an acre in this country.

As regards the future of the wheat trade, it is to be observed that the late harvests in America have been unusually abundant, and, as Mr. Drummond points out, with the revival of trade, freights are not likely to continue at their present low rate. Between New York and Chicago the competition of the lake route with the railways has reduced the cost of transport to the lowest amount possible, and in the more remote districts the lines of railways have a practical monopoly, and the expenses of working and restoring the permanent way must force them to raise their freights.

Further, the now scanty population of these districts is rapidly increasing, and the surplus available for exportation will possibly be contracted. There is, it is true, an unbounded extent of land available for settlements, but then the cost of freight will increase in proportion to the distance of these settlements from the port of shipment. It is said to be within the bounds of possibility that American wheat may be sold in Liverpool for 35s. per quarter. For the reasons we have given we do not believe that, in existing circumstances, this can be done; but if direct water communication can be established with the Winnipeg region it is impossible to predict what the result may be. But the price of wheat further depends on the

demand. In the past year, for instance, the yield has been deficient, not only in England, but throughout Europe. In France it has been 22 per cent. below the average, and there is an enormous demand for American wheat, and the price has consequently risen very rapidly since the harvest. Supply, it is true, adjusts itself to demand, but the production of wheat is liable to be affected by a number of causes altogether beyond the control of man; it must therefore be subject to constant fluctuations in price. It is impossible to speak confidently of the future, but it appears to us that though the settlements of the North-Western prairie will prevent the recurrence of the high prices which were realised even two years ago, we shall probably not obtain our wheat at lower prices than we have been lately paying. The increased area brought into cultivation in America every year barely keeps pace with the rapid increase of the population. There are nearly fifty millions of American citizens to be fed. The surplus of their supply of food can alone be exported. As in the case of wheat, the trade in fresh meat and animals depends on the cost of rearing stock in the States, and on the rates of transport. Vast herds of cattle are fed on the natural dried grass on the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains. The business is conducted on a large scale, some herdsmen, Mr. Brassey tells us in his speech on Mr. Chaplin's motion, owning 75,000 head of cattle. These grass-fed animals are not fit for market till they are four years old, and up to that time they cost 6 dollars, or 25s., according to Mr. Brassey, or 4 dollars (16s. 8d.) according to Mr. Drummond. They are transported at a cost of 8 dollars from Colorado to Chicago, and there fetch from 35 to 45 dollars apiece. The numbers of the American herds are rapidly increasing, and great improvements are being made both in the quality and weight of the animals, especially the Texan cattle. It is probable that the railways will raise their rates, and if the Government lay a charge, however small, for pasturage on the public lands, which Mr. Brassey seems to think probable, it will seriously affect the profits of the herdsmen.

At present the wholesale price of prime beef at New York ranges from $4\frac{1}{2}d.$ to $5d.$ per lb. Dead American meat is sold in London for $6\frac{1}{2}d.$ per lb., and as long as shippers obtain $7d.$ or $7\frac{1}{2}d.$ per lb. for their prime beef (and they have obtained $9d.$) the trade will continue to be remunerative. The prime bullocks at New York weigh about 1,400 lbs. They appear to deteriorate but little in condition during the voyage, and landed at Liverpool they fetch prices varying from 20l. to 24l. apiece. Mr. Caird remarks on this subject: 'Under any circumstances

'the English producer has the advantage of at least a penny a pound in the cost and risk of transport against his Transatlantic competitor. It is an advantage equal to 4*l.* on an average ox. Of this natural advantage nothing can deprive him, and with this he may rest content.' Unluckily, since Mr. Caird wrote, a part of this natural advantage has been lost. Freights, which in the early part of the year were 3*l.* 10*s.* to 4*l.* 5*s.*, are now reduced to 2*l.* 10*s.* to 3*l.* Notwithstanding the restrictions now placed on the trade, one firm alone shipped 2,800 head of cattle to England in the last week of July; and when these restrictions are removed, there is no doubt that the trade will be pushed to the utmost. Without the more complete information which the delegates of the Royal Commission will, we trust, obtain for us, it is almost impossible to form an opinion upon its probable effects on the home market. The population of this country is increasing at the rate of about a thousand a day. That of America is progressing still more rapidly, and the revival of trade in both countries will still further increase the demand for animal food, and will in all probability raise the cost of transport—which must always, to a certain extent, act as a protection to the home producer.

The vast extension of the American food trade which we have just described, occurring at a time when our farmers are suffering from the accumulated effects of a succession of bad seasons, has caused an alarm among agriculturists which is not wholly unreasonable. We may at once dismiss, as impracticable, the idea of reverting to a policy of protection—Reciprocity, as it is now called—which is the essence of Mr. Chaplin's speech. It is quite unnecessary in the pages of this Journal to restate the well-worn arguments against these exploded fallacies. We can only meet our foreign rivals by reducing the cost of production at home; and the best method of accomplishing this end would be, if possible, to increase the productiveness of the soil. The question then arises, whether the laws, under which the land of this country is held, tend to encourage or impede the development of its resources; and to this question we shall now address ourselves, dealing in the first place with the case of the owners, and then with the occupiers, of the land.

In this country three distinct classes of persons are interested in the cultivation of the soil, each contributing its share of capital or labour, and receiving its share of the produce. The landowner supplies the land and buildings, which constitute about four-fifths of the whole capital employed; and he receives a fixed rent, which, after deducting expenses,

rarely exceeds $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the value of his property. The farmer supplies the remaining fifth of the capital, which is employed in conducting the business of the farm; he takes upon himself all risks and responsibilities, and receives the profits, which depend upon the seasons and other circumstances. The amount of his capital may be taken, on an average, at 7*l.* or 8*l.* per acre, but it varies with the conditions of his holding, and, according to Mr. Caird, he should make 8 or 10 per cent. on this capital, including wages of superintendence. Thirdly, the labourer tills the land, which he does not own, and is paid his weekly wages.

The area of Great Britain comprises 56,815,353 acres, of which 31,975,784 acres are cultivated by about 560,000 occupiers; their farms vary in extent from a thousand acres and more downwards, but they do not, on an average, exceed 57 acres, and only 18 per cent. of them are more than 100 acres in extent. The agricultural labourers in England and Wales, according to the last census, numbered 764,574. The land-owners are a much smaller class; in England and Wales 269,547 persons own more than one acre, but a large number of these possess only a small quantity of land, and are to be regarded as householders rather than agriculturists. Many elaborate calculations have been made to prove the undoubted fact that a large proportion of the land of this country is concentrated in the hands of a comparatively small number of owners. Mr. Kay states that two-thirds of Great Britain is owned by 10,537 persons; but moderate-sized estates, from 100 to 500 acres, are not wanting; they occupy one-fifth of the area of England and Wales. 'In short,' in Mr. Caird's words, 'our system is that of large capitalists owning the land; of smaller capitalists, each cultivating five times more of it than they would have means to do if they owned their farms; and of labourers, free to carry their labour to any market which they consider most remunerative.'

It is against this system that the party which has adopted the undefined and indefinable expression 'Free land' as their motto, direct their attacks. This party is too often actuated more by political motives than by a mere desire to improve the agricultural condition of the country; wishing, rightly or wrongly, to see large democratic reforms introduced into our social and political constitution, they not unnaturally regard the landed aristocracy with feelings of undisguised hostility. With this aspect of the land question we are not at present concerned; as far as possible we shall endeavour to discuss it from a purely agricultural point of view.

At present the land theory most in vogue is, that it is desirable to substitute for landlords, tenants, and labourers, a large number of small or even peasant proprietors. There is, no doubt, something very attractive in the picture which the advocates of this scheme draw of each peasant living in a state of Arcadian simplicity under his own vine and under his own fig-tree. Unfortunately this picture is not always true to the life. Writers on the subject are inclined to exaggerate both the happiness and misery of small proprietors to support their arguments for or against the *petite culture*. Where subdivision is not carried to extreme lengths, and the circumstances of soil, climate, and associations are favourable to the system, as is the case in the Channel Islands, in many departments of France, and other parts of Europe, especially where the cultivation of the vine, of vegetables, or fruit requires and repays minute and constant attention, or where the little industries created by the *culture industrielle* flourish, we find an amount of comfort and moderate wealth diffused throughout the community which we search for in vain on this side of the Channel. On the other hand, though, as long as they are not overburdened with debt, the peasants who own small plots of ground are represented as contented with their position, their lot is not in all respects an enviable one. They lead a life of unremitting toil, devoured with petty solitudes, stinting themselves in their miserable diet, generally less well housed and clothed than ordinary labourers. They exaggerate to a fault the habits of thrift and economy which excite our admiration, and in which the wage-earning classes of this country are lamentably deficient. Mr. Richardson thus describes them in his account of the 'Corn- and Cattle-producing Districts of France:—

'The peasant owners, examples of industry and thrift carried to excess, slave to get as much out of the land as it can be made to yield, starving themselves and their families to add something to their hoard; their wives becoming prematurely old from field labour and bent from carrying heavy loads of fodder to the cow at home; content if at the year's end the tale of silver pieces be increased; doing their share towards making France the richest country in the world, but at a sacrifice of all that makes life worth living for.'

Too often the peasant is involved in debt, and this is especially the case where the *morcellement* has been carried to excess. The small properties in France and Germany are frequently subdivided into still smaller plots of not more than a few perches in extent, intersected by other holdings, and often separated by considerable distances. Litigation is in

such cases easy and frequent; titles are complicated; boundaries are uncertain; good cultivation is impossible. Mr. Baring Gould gives us, as an instance of excessive *morcellement* in Würtemberg, a nut-tree to which thirty persons had claims; when the nuts were gathered they were parted into thirty lots. He says: 'An English labourer lives in luxury compared to these small farmers, who drag on in squalor and misery, bowed under debt to the Jew, who lies in wait to sell them up.' This remark applies only to the encumbered proprietors. We do not wish to carry this argument too far, or to deny that, under favourable circumstances, the system of small proprietors has been found to answer well in many countries in which it exists. But, apart from the question whether its adoption is practicable or, from an agricultural point of view, desirable in this country, we have endeavoured to show that, as regards the condition of the people, its advantages are not so unmixed as its advocates would have us believe.

For our present purpose, however, the most important argument in favour of the substitution of small for large properties is that the change would materially increase the productiveness of the soil. It is very difficult to institute a fair comparison between the two systems. To enable us to do so we should require two areas of land differing from one another only in the fact that the one was divided into large, the other into small estates; but the great variety of causes which influence the agriculture of a country renders it impossible to comply with this condition. All we can do is to compare the agricultural results of those countries in which the two systems generally prevail. The Agricultural Returns for 1876 furnish us with materials for this comparison. The average yield of wheat per acre is stated in this return to be:—

	Bushels		Bushels
In Holland . . .	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	In France . . .	13 $\frac{1}{2}$
In Belgium . . .	20 $\frac{1}{3}$	In Austria . . .	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
In Würtemberg . .	18	In Hungary . . .	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
In Bavaria . . .	16 $\frac{1}{3}$	In Russia . . .	5 $\frac{1}{2}$

The average yield in England Mr. Caird puts at 28 bushels per acre, but it is generally calculated to exceed that estimate by $1\frac{1}{2}$ bushel. Holland is our nearest rival; Belgium follows at a long interval; and in France the yield, which is now reckoned at 16 bushels, is not much more than half the yield of this country. In the production of meat our farmers are no less successful than in that of wheat. The cultivated area

of the United Kingdom is not much more than half that of France, yet it supports 10,000,000 head of cattle and 32,000,000 sheep, against the 11,700,000 cattle and 26,000,000 sheep owned by our neighbours. The English cattle and sheep, moreover, individually produce far more meat, and come to maturity at an earlier age, than the French. Our whole meat production is therefore actually greater, but in proportion to area, if M. de Lavergne's calculations may be accepted as fairly accurate, it is nearly four times greater, than that of France. In Holland a hundred acres support nine more cattle than they do with us, but fifty fewer sheep. In Belgium the proportion is still more favourable to us. But it is unnecessary to pursue these comparisons further. Enough has been said to prove that under our system the land has been rendered far more productive than in any other part of the world. In the case of France it has been stated that the comparison is unfair on the small cultivators, because the general average of the country is reduced by the indifferent farming on the large estates. There is probably some truth in this statement, but not enough to account for the difference between us. Properties are in France divided into three classes:—

(1) Averaging 600 acres, numbering about 50,000.

(2) Averaging 60 acres, numbering 2,500,000.

(3) Averaging 6 acres, numbering about 5,000,000.

Some of these seven and a half million small properties are admirably cultivated, and their yield may equal, or even exceed, the average of England; but it is impossible to believe that the inferior management of the comparatively small area occupied by estates of the first class, which are gradually diminishing in number, could have as important an effect as has been suggested on the general average of the country.

Our superiority is not due to any physical causes; on the contrary, Arthur Young a hundred years ago, and M. de Lavergne in the present generation, admit that both in soil, climate, and in the variety of the crops which can be grown, our neighbours have enormous advantages over us. The proportion of poor land is very much smaller, and, as Arthur Young says, 'their tenacious clays do not take the character of clays which in most parts of England are so stubborn and harsh that the expense of cultivation is almost equal to a moderate produce.' The climate is less damp and much hotter, less favourable to pasture, but far more suitable for the cultivation of corn and other cereals, as well as of fruit and vegetables. But in spite of these natural advantages one acre in England produces as much, or nearly as much, as two acres in France.

This is not our whole case. Not only is the produce in England more abundant than elsewhere, but it is produced by the labour of a much smaller proportion of the population. If we produced 28 bushels an acre by employing double the amount of labourers which are required to produce 16 bushels in France, we should not be able to boast of any great superiority; for in that case the proportion of food to be divided among its producers would be the same, and there would be little, if any, more surplus for the non-agricultural consumers. According to a table drawn up by M. Block for the Prussian Government, which is published in Mr. Harris Gastrell's report on land tenure in Prussia, in France and Belgium 51 per cent. of the population are engaged in agricultural pursuits. In Prussia the proportion is 45, in Holland 16, and in England only 12 per cent.

There is one other test which we can apply to the two systems, viz., the amount of capital which is invested in cultivation. M. de Lavergne rightly attributes the superiority of British agriculture not so much to the prevalence of large farms as to the fact that more capital is used in their cultivation. He estimates that the *capital d'exploitation* of an English tenant is four times greater than that of a French farmer. In the French system the peasant proprietor finds the fixed capital, which only yields a return of 2 to 3 per cent., as well as the working capital. In England, on the other hand, the owner finds the larger but less profitable capital, which leaves the tenant's resources free to be applied entirely to cultivation.

It is said with truth that the peasant, under the magical influence of proprietorship, will labour with unremitting industry, and will raise from a poor soil a greater amount of produce than if it were farmed on a larger scale; but this is the gross produce, that is, the total produce without making any deduction for expenses. When this deduction is made, it will be found that, as the cost of management is proportionately greater on a small than on a large farm, the net produce of the latter is much the greater of the two.

The tendency of the present day in all other industries is in the direction of concentration. Domestic manufactures have been replaced by vast mills; the hand-loom and the spinning-jenny have been superseded by the power-loom and the mule, simply with a view of economising labour. The same principle is applicable to agriculture. A large farm can, as a rule, be more economically managed than a small property; labour is more easily systematised, and labour-saving machines can be employed, which a small proprietor has not capital enough to

purchase, or land enough to render remunerative; and both live and dead stock can be managed on more scientific principles and with a greater saving of labour.

Tested, therefore, either by results, or by economy of management, or by the amount of capital attracted to the soil, the English system compares most favourably with that of other nations. It is therefore a complete fallacy to suppose that the existing depression can be relieved by any change which would substitute for large and moderate-sized tenancies a number of small properties—a change which would be a distinctly retrograde step in the agricultural history of this country.

If, however, such a step were desirable, is it practicable? The gradual extinction of the race of yeomen is much to be regretted; and we should be as glad as Mr. Kay and his disciples to see labourers and farmers purchasing small estates. But all the land of England is not locked up, as they would have us believe; a very large number of acres annually change hands. Why, then, do not small purchasers buy land? and why are the yeomen disappearing? In the first place, the desire to possess land does not prevail in this country to the same degree as in France and other countries of Europe; and it is difficult, if not impossible, artificially to create this desire. Then, again, the labourers have no capital, and the farmers have no wish to purchase freeholds, for the obvious reason that it does not pay. Take, for instance, a farmer with a capital of 3,000*l.*; he might rent a farm worth 300*l.* or 350*l.* per annum, and have an ample working capital; this capital would, in ordinary seasons, make a return of from 8 to 10 per cent., which would give him an income of 240*l.* or 300*l.*, and in addition to this he would have his house and buildings found and kept in repair for him. If, on the other hand, he purchased a freehold, what would be his position? He would purchase a farm worth 100*l.* a year; he would lay out 2,000*l.* of his capital in the purchase, and would perhaps raise 1,000*l.* on mortgage, for which he would have to pay 40*l.* a year. He has remaining 1,000*l.* with which to stock and work his land. On this capital he would make 80*l.* to 100*l.* His whole income would therefore amount to 180*l.* to 200*l.* per annum, from which must be deducted 40*l.* for interest on mortgage, and something further for the repair of his buildings and the permanent improvement of his land. It is impossible to doubt which of the two positions is preferable.

Or again, take the case of the Cumberland statesmen, who are unfortunately disappearing. These statesmen hold from fifty to eighty acres, and have certain rights of pasturages

on the adjoining mountains. They used to cultivate their properties with the aid of their families, and lived, as they farmed, in a rough but respectable manner; but the development of the iron trade, and the consequent extension of railways in that county, has entirely changed the aspect of affairs. The value of land has risen to 150*l.* and even 250*l.* an acre, and besides this the statesman's most vigorous and intelligent sons, finding that they can earn more money in the manufacturing towns, refuse to stay at home and cultivate the paternal acres; he is therefore forced to employ hired labour, and, as wages range from 18*s.* to 20*s.* a week, he cannot afford to do this; and he sells his patrimony at a high price to the neighbouring landowner.

If, then, we are unable to preserve the small freeholders who have been established on their estates for centuries, are we likely to preserve those whom it is proposed to create by some magic of legislation, except by making their holdings inalienable—a proceeding which is unjust in itself, and which would tie up the land far more strictly than any entails or settlements?

Two methods of creating small properties have been suggested by the more ardent reformers. The first method is the adoption of the principle of the Code Napoléon, compulsory subdivision of property. Mr. Kay repudiates this method except as a last resource. The ten acres, which may suffice for a single family, are more and more subdivided to satisfy the claims of succeeding generations, or else they are encumbered with ever-increasing charges which have been incurred in buying up the portions of the younger children, or from other causes. It is admitted on all hands that the advantages of small properties are conditional on their not being too minutely divided. This limit has been, as we have already shown, passed in some parts of France and Germany. The *morcellement* has been in a great measure checked in France by the smallness of families among the agricultural population. The compulsory subdivision of land is partly neutralised by the custom of unigeniture. The excess of births over deaths in a population of 36,000,000 is little more than 100,000 a year; and if we only accounted for the agriculturists, there would be found to be rather a decrease in numbers. In this country the increase is, with a smaller population, more than 400,000. This state of things is causing a considerable amount of disquietude among French agriculturists, though Mr. Kay, curiously enough, does not appear to have alluded to it, and no sane man would wish to introduce it into this country, where

the surplus population finds a vent either in emigration or in industrial employments.

The second method is referred to by Lord Beaconsfield in his Aylesbury speech; it consists of a system of loans to be granted by the State, to enable labourers, who are without capital, to purchase small freeholds. Under this system the small proprietor would be placed in a very disadvantageous position. He would start with nothing but borrowed capital; his small estate would be charged, for at least thirty years, with an annual payment for interest and instalments of this capital far exceeding the rent which his neighbours were paying for their holdings. And the State, if it accepts these responsibilities, must be relentless in exacting full and punctual payments: it can listen to no appeals *ad misericordiam*, if the poor man's pig dies, or if his cow has misfortunes, or if his crops fail. The farm labourers must be endowed with more forethought and self-denial than we give them credit for, if they consent to accept these conditions with a view of securing a small freehold for themselves, or more probably for their children, at the end of thirty years. Moreover, it is, in our opinion, a most objectionable practice, except in very exceptional circumstances, for the State to perform the functions of a great money-lender. Either it lends money on sufficient security and at the current rate of interest, in which case its action is unnecessary, for the money can be obtained in the usual way; or it lends on bad security and at a low rate of interest, to the advantage of the borrower, in which case the whole body of taxpayers must incur risk, and suffer loss, for the sake of a comparatively small class of the community. We see no way of escape from the horns of this dilemma. If the advocates of peasant proprietors are confident of success, it would be easy for them, either by private agency or some such machinery as the Land Improvement Companies, to advance the necessary amount of capital. At the present time there can be no difficulty in obtaining suitable land at a cheap rate, and we should be very glad to see the experiment tried and succeed. But there is, we maintain, no case for the intervention of the State.

The majority of writers on agricultural reform reject these and similar projects, and content themselves with denouncing the land laws, which they allege counteract the effects of natural laws, impede the distribution of land, and, at the same time, prevent its possessors from developing its resources. At a time like the present it was neither to be expected nor desired that these laws should escape criticism. Unfortunately these discussions are rarely conducted in a sober and rational

manner; both parties are apt to indulge in statements of an equally exaggerated character—the one holding it to be a crime little short of sacrilege to hint that the law of entail is capable of amendment; the other bitterly denouncing the same law as the root of all agricultural and political grievances. We shall endeavour to steer clear of Scylla and Charybdis; and to enable us to do so, it is well to have, at starting, a perfectly clear idea of what these laws are.

The law of England allows a testator the most absolute freedom to dispose of his property as he thinks fit. It only interferes to limit his right of tying it up for a longer period than twenty-one years after the expiration of a life or lives in existence, when the deed of settlement or will begins to operate. This is the law of entail, which, it is to be observed, is a restraining, not an enabling law. In case of intestacy it is provided that, while the personal property is equally divided among the dead man's heirs, his land goes to his eldest son to the exclusion of his other children. This is the law of primogeniture. The points in dispute are whether, in the last case, the land should be subject to the same law as other property, and in the first case whether it is desirable still further to restrict the power to bind property after death; they involve social and political questions of great importance, but these do not fall within the scope of the present article.

The law of primogeniture is undoubtedly a relic of the feudal system which survives only in this country. Its operation is in no way compulsory; it allows the owner full power to leave his estates to any one of his children, or to distribute them as he thinks fit. Its repeal would leave him in the same position; the only difference would be that, in the case of intestacy, land would be divided as personal property is now. The presumption of law would be changed; but the practical effect would, we believe, be far less important than the advocates of the change imagine. The feeling of the owners is in favour of primogeniture, and the custom would in all probability be maintained, unless, of course, the subdivision of property were made compulsory, which, for reasons already given, would, in our opinion, be a great disaster, and may be regarded as outside the range of practical politics. The questions of entail and settlement involve issues of much greater interest. Mr. Pusey's famous committee estimated that two-thirds of the United Kingdom were under settlement. There is no trustworthy information on the subject, but this estimate is probably not far from correct. Settlements are effected either by will or by family arrangements, as in the

case of marriage settlements; and though their operation is limited by law in the manner described above, they are in practice perpetuated by periodical resettlements, which are frequently made, when the heir-in-tail comes of age or when he marries; he then voluntarily forfeits his prospect of succeeding to his estate as absolute owner, and in return usually receives an increased allowance from the estate. In this manner the owners of many properties have for generations never had more than a life interest in them. There is some difference between a settlement made under a will and one made on marriage. In the latter case the owner voluntarily and with full knowledge of the facts accepts the position of a life tenant, and the settlement may, with his son's consent, be broken on his coming of age. In the former case the owner is by his own sole act able to tie up his estate for a much longer period. The object of these arrangements is to preserve the estates of a family in their integrity, and to prevent their alienation.

The position of the tenant for life is much more favourable than it was ten years ago, but he is still seriously and often most injuriously hampered in the management of his property. Though he is presumably capable of managing his own affairs, he is bound down by all sorts of trusts, conditions, and covenants, solely with the object that the property of which he is possessor should descend to his son in exactly the same condition as he received it from his father. The father is able absolutely to fetter the discretion of his son, and perhaps of his grandson after him, for the sake of a generation which may not be born for fifty years after his death. The limited owner has power, under recent Acts of Parliament, to grant leases for twenty-one years, and in the case of building or mines for ninety-nine and forty years. But the most important disability under which he is placed relates to his powers of sale. He cannot sell an acre of land, however desirable it may be to do so, until his son, the tenant-in-tail, attains the age of twenty-one and gives his consent. It is true that powers of sale are inserted in almost all modern settlements; but the application of the moneys which may arise from such sales is invariably limited, either to the purchase of other land, or less frequently to the payment of encumbrances. Again, under the Settled Estates Act (1877) the Court of Chancery may authorise the sale of part of an estate, but for certain defined purposes only, viz. the purchase or redemption of the tithe rent charge, or of a crown or quit rent; the discharge of encumbrances on the settled property and the purchase of other land to be settled in

the same manner. It is obvious, therefore, that for purposes of improving his property the limited owner is unable to sell an acre; and in all cases his powers are restricted and hampered. We shall return to his power of borrowing presently.

The mere size of an estate has, as Lord Derby very justly observed, no effect on the cultivation of the soil. If in any district there are a number of farms averaging 100 acres each, other things being equal, it makes no difference, as far as agriculture is concerned, whether they are owned by one, ten, or twenty individuals. What is of importance is that the landlord should have sufficient capital to keep his farms in good order. It is the same case with the landlord and his estate as with the farmer and his holding; if he is weighed down with a load of mortgages incurred by himself or his fathers, and he has no capital or credit, whether he owns a large or a small property, it must inevitably deteriorate in productiveness and in value, and his tenants must suffer in proportion. In such a case as this the estate might be relieved by selling some outlying farms or even a portion of the main property. It would obviously be to the advantage of the owner and the public to do so; but it may be impossible because some owner, who may have been dead for years, has willed it otherwise. Worse cases than this are unfortunately not unknown, in which the revenues of an estate have been assigned to the creditors of an insolvent life tenant; their interest is obviously to get as much out of it and to spend as little upon it as they can. The question then arises whether it is better that an ancient but impecunious family should retain possession of all its estates, or that they should pass into the hands of a solvent proprietor.

It is further to be observed that in an entailed estate the heir of the life tenant has very large powers of raising money on his reversionary interest for the purpose of gratifying his extravagant or vicious tastes; his powers are limited only by the supposed value of the property and by his chances of surviving the life tenant. He may refuse to resettle the estate, and actually sell it to money-lenders over his father's head. It is, in the interest of great estates, very doubtful whether this is a satisfactory state of things.

On the other hand it may be argued that a life owner has less power of encumbering his estate with mortgages than an absolute owner; and that entailed and unentailed estates are equally subject to family charges; and further that those who are desirous of securing the existence of small properties are

guilty of some inconsistency in advocating the abolition of settlements, which in many instances prevent these small estates from being absorbed by their larger and more wealthy neighbours.

That there are evils in the state of things which we have described can hardly be denied. Various remedies have been suggested for them. The extreme reformers would abolish altogether the power of creating life estates; others, again, would limit settlements to lives actually in being. We are not disposed to prescribe so drastic a treatment. The adoption of the former proposal would be unjustly restrictive, and would cause no small amount of inconvenience and possibly hardship; and if the latter course were deemed worthy of adoption, an exception would have to be made of marriage settlements. It is but right and prudent that the husband should make due provision for his widow and for his unborn children, though, for reasons already adduced, we think that in many cases he might with advantage retain greater powers, than are now usual, of dealing with his property.

The way of meeting these difficulties, to which the fewest objections could be urged, would be to simplify and enlarge the limited owner's power of selling portions of his property, either with a view of relieving it of encumbrances or of improving its condition, some guarantee being required that the purchase-money should be laid out in permanently improving the estate, or invested in some form more advantageous to the *cestui que trusts*. An application in every case to the Court of Chancery would be expensive and harassing; but if the purposes to which it was applicable were confined to paying off charges and mortgages, or to improvements which add to the 'letting value' of the farms (following the provisions of the Agricultural Holdings Act, which allows limited owners to charge their estates with compensation to farmers for permanent improvements), the matter could, we think, be left in the hands of the life tenant and his trustees without any serious danger of abuse. Rare cases may occur of estates so heavily encumbered that the owner can only be relieved of his embarrassments by selling the whole of them, in which case the surplus of the purchase-money would be of course settled in the same manner as the estate had been.

We have no sympathy with many of the arguments which are brought forward in support of these and larger reforms. We set a high value on the social and also on the agricultural influence of the great hereditary families, and should regret extremely to see that influence impaired. We believe, moreover, that, as a rule, the large estates are managed on more

liberal and enlightened principles than the smaller properties, which are more often heavily encumbered. There are, however, exceptions to this rule, and the position of a landowner, who is too poor to keep up an estate which he is prohibited from selling, is a very unfortunate one for himself, and may be a public calamity. In such hopeless cases as this, if there were a power of sale, a part or the whole of the estate would change hands. But even if settlements were abolished, much less if the moderate reform suggested above were adopted, the effect on the amount of land in the market would probably be very slight; for, whether under settlement or not, landowners cling to their family properties to the last, and, except under the pressure of overwhelming difficulties, will rarely if ever part with them. But even if a great deal more land were annually sold, there is, for reasons which we have already given, little probability that farmers or labourers would come forward as purchasers; they could not compete with the large capitalists, who, anxious to obtain the social position and other advantages which are attached to the ownership of land, are content with a low rate of interest on their investment; and therefore, though some few properties might change hands, the distribution of land would not be promoted to any appreciable extent.

Before leaving this part of our subject, we must briefly refer to one other allegation which is constantly made against our land system, namely, the difficulties and expense which attend the transfer of land. There can be no difference of opinion as to the truth of this allegation, or as to the desirability of some reform which would so simplify titles 'as to render it as easy 'to sell land as to sell a ship or any other property.' The first preliminary condition indispensable to such a reform is the establishment of a complete register of all estates. In Scotland all deeds are registered, solicitors use short statutory forms in conveyancing, and their charges are calculated on an *ad valorem* scale. In Ireland there is also a registering office under the Landed Estates Court, which has been only moderately successful. In Yorkshire and in Middlesex there are offices for registering deeds, which, in the latter case at any rate, do not appear to have simplified legal difficulties. In all foreign countries landowners have their titles registered, and the admirable land transfer system, of which Sir Robert Torrens is the author, has worked with the greatest success in the Australian colonies. It is generally admitted that the registration of titles, not the registration of deeds, should be aimed at; but the difficulties which beset legal reformers in

this country are best proved by the failure which has attended the efforts of successive Chancellors. In 1862 Lord Westbury passed his Land Transfer Act. Six years later it was shown by a Royal Commission to be almost inoperative. Lord Cairns' Act of 1875, which was based on the recommendation of that Commission, has not proved to be more effective, though it enabled proprietors to register not only an 'absolute' title, but also a 'qualified' title, depending simply on possession and maturing by lapse of time into an absolute title; only forty-eight titles have been registered in four years. The Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, which was issued last session, is the last addition to the literature on this subject. It is there stated that Lord Cairns' Act has failed because 'the public or their professional advisers' have deliberately made up their minds that the advantages 'offered by the new system of registration are too speculative' and remote to compensate for the immediate and certain 'outlay and trouble which are inseparable from it;' and, further, that the complication of English titles, resulting partly from settlements and entails, partly from our absurd system of raising money on mortgage, which they rightly condemn, constitutes an impediment to registration which did not exist in Australia; where 'the title starts with an unimpeachable grant' from the Crown, following upon an official survey, the 'effect of which is to give every landowner two things which' are the stumbling-blocks of English conveyancers—a perfect 'root of title to his property, and a trustworthy key to its identity.' The conclusion at which they arrive cannot be deemed satisfactory. On the authority of Mr. Follett and Mr. Holt, they admit 'that no system of registration can be devised' which will be voluntarily adopted; and, on the other hand, 'they are told by the Lord Chancellor that he has not yet' seen any way in which the registration of titles can be made 'compulsory.' We should be glad if it could be made compulsory for future purchasers of land to register their purchases, but the subject is surrounded with difficulties, and we are unwilling to plunge more deeply into the mazes of this intricate question. The difficulties and cost of transferring land are, we had almost said, a scandal, and they proportionately increase as the quantity of land to be dealt with decreases in amount. Any heaven-sent legislator who can devise an effectual remedy for this state of things would be entitled to the gratitude of existing and future generations. Whether such a reform would tend to the diffusion or the concentration of estates is a matter for speculation; very confident

opinions have been expressed on both sides. We are inclined to think that it would not have any very marked effect in either direction. Land, it is true, would be more easily sold in small lots, and the legal expenses of transferring these lots, which now often amount to a considerable percentage on the purchase-money, would be reduced; but, on the other hand, we do not now find that, even in favourable circumstances, small proprietors bid for plots of ground, and there is no reason to believe that they would be induced to do so by a reduction in the cost of conveyancing.

We now come to the important question of the improvement of land. Permanent improvements, speaking generally, are of three kinds: renewing or improving farm buildings, erecting labourers' cottages, and draining. Statements of a somewhat exaggerated and misleading character are not unfrequently made on this subject. For instance, Mr. Bailey Denton informed a Select Committee of the House of Lords, six years ago (Question 723), that there are 20,000,000 acres of wet land which require draining in England and Wales, of which only 3,000,000 acres have been drained. We should be glad to know where these 20,000,000 acres are to be found, the whole cultivated area of England and Wales not exceeding 27,000,000 acres. On being pressed for an explanation of this extraordinary statement, the witness (Question 804) admitted that the 17,000,000 acres to which he referred could not be drained profitably—that is, so as to pay 5 per cent. on the outlay—but that 'some years hence land which we now 'consider would not pay for draining, would possibly pay 'then.' But if he exaggerates the quantity of land which requires draining, we cannot but think that he errs quite as much in the other direction in his estimate of the quantity of land which has already been drained. This estimate is purely speculative, and probably inaccurate. We have referred especially to these figures, because they have been frequently quoted of late, and may mislead the unwary unless they are read by the light of the witness's subsequent answer.

Then, again, we are constantly told that the agricultural produce of the country could be doubled. No doubt it might be doubled, or quadrupled if you will; but would the increased yield be obtained at a greater or less cost of production than the present yield? If at a greater cost, which we believe to be the more probable opinion, we should *pro tanto* be in a worse position than we are at present. Taking the increase of production apart from the cost at which it is gained is both unfair and misleading. But, allowing for exaggerations, the land

without doubt is capable of vast improvements, which would repay landlords a fair return, and confer a benefit on the country.

During the last thirty years large sums have been laid out on the soil; 12,000,000*l.* have been advanced for this purpose by the Government and by land companies, and these loans continue to be raised at the rate of 500,000*l.* a year. Mr. Caird estimates the expenditure out of private capital at three times this amount; we should have thought this estimate too low. Some of this money may have been wasted in works injudiciously planned or inefficiently executed. Farm buildings have in too many cases been erected on too large and expensive a scale for the farms to which they are attached, and have become a burden, rather than a benefit, both to the owner and occupier. Draining, again, which has in the first instance been badly carried out, or which has been subsequently neglected, has become useless after the lapse of very few years. In improving an estate judgment is almost as necessary as capital. But, on the whole, the expenditure is shown by the evidence given to the Lords Committee to have been fairly remunerative. Mr. Caird states that the gross annual value of land assessed to the income tax has risen in England from 41,177,000*l.* in 1857 to 50,125,000*l.* in 1875, an increase of 21 per cent. in eighteen years. In Scotland the increase has been 26 per cent. It is impossible to estimate how much of this increase is due to the improvement of the land, and how much is due to the rise in the price of meat and dairy produce, to the increased wealth of the country, and to the activity of assessment committees and revenue officers. The last cause, though unnoticed by Mr. Caird, has had an important effect on Schedule A of the income tax. Though much has been done in the way of improving land, a great deal more remains undone; and we may fairly ask why the progress has not been more rapid. In the first place, in some of the less enlightened districts tenant farmers, unlike their Scotch brethren, rather discourage improvements, from their disinclination to pay the 5 or 6 per cent. which the owner not unreasonably demands on his outlay.

Then, again, as the House of Lords Committee point out, 'the investment is not sufficiently lucrative to offer much attraction to capital,' and this difficulty has latterly been increased by the rise in the price of labour and materials. Decent cottages cannot be built for less than 150*l.* to 200*l.* each, and, as they are let to labourers for 1*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* a week, they can only pay by adding to the general value of the farms on which they are

situated. As to farm buildings, which, if new, cost at least from four to six years' purchase of the holding, and increase in cost in inverse ratio to the size of the farms, it is impossible to calculate what return they make. They are as indispensable to a tenant as the land itself: without buildings, or with buildings in bad condition, a farm cannot be let. Moreover, to quote the words of the Report, 'the erection of buildings frequently represents the discharge of accumulated arrears of maintenance, rather than an improvement properly so called.' Drainage, no doubt, pays better; tenants are generally ready to pay 5, and in Scotland sometimes 7, per cent. on the outlay. But the cost of draining has greatly increased, and cannot now be executed for less than 7*l.* to 10*l.* an acre; and the fact that in certain conditions the pipes are liable to be choked, and the doubt as to the length of time for which they will continue efficient, introduce a speculative element even into this investment. In spite of these drawbacks, we believe that money judiciously spent in improving his estate will bring the landlord a very fair annual return, adding at the same time to the value of his capital—the land. But he is generally actuated by other than purely commercial considerations—by 'solicitude for his descendants,' by the feelings of pride and pleasure in seeing his estate in high order and his tenants prosperous and contented, and by a sense of the responsibilities which are inseparable from his position. There are bad landlords, as there are bad manufacturers and bad merchants, who care only for the amount of sport and amusement which they can get from their estates. Such men fully deserve Mr. Kay's sarcasms, but they do not represent, as he would have us suppose, the almost invariable picture of the 'country gentleman.'

The difficulty, however, which generally stands in the way of an improving landlord, is want of capital. If he is owner in fee and his property is unencumbered, he can easily raise money at 4 per cent., or sell a portion of his property. But all landlords are not in this fortunate position. Either they may be limited owners, in which case they are unable to sell, and can only borrow disadvantageously on the security of their life estate; or, again, their estates, whether settled or not, may be heavily charged with family portions or mortgages. In such cases Parliament has given them the means of obtaining advances from land improvement companies, their loans taking priority over all previous charges. The companies usually lend at the rate of 4½ per cent., in addition to an annual instalment of the principal, which is in most cases repaid in twenty-five years. There are, moreover, the preliminary charges of

the companies for the use of their Act and legal expenses, and of the Enclosure Commissioners for inspection, which, on an average, amount to 7 per cent. on the whole loan, and which are added to the principal, so that the borrower has to charge his estate to the extent of $6\frac{1}{2}$ or 7 per cent. on his outlay for twenty-five years. This is a heavy charge, and is rarely, if ever, met by a corresponding rise of rent. Besides this, the owner's discretion in executing his works is controlled by the paternal despotism of the Enclosure Commissioners or their inspector, which, though often unpopular, does not appear to be injudiciously exercised, and is thought necessary for the protection of remainder-men or of mortgagees, and is justified by the exceptional advantages which are allowed to the borrower.

These Acts were primarily intended for the relief of limited owners, but they have been largely used by owners in fee, for the family charges may be, and often are, quite as heavy in the one case as in the other, and the mortgages are likely to be more onerous on a fee simple than on a settled estate. The limited owner is under the disabilities in borrowing and in selling to which we have referred above. If he has any personal property, he would wish to devote it to his younger children instead of using it to increase the value of his eldest son's inheritance, and the heavy charges incurred in borrowing from the companies would seriously impair his annual income, which is probably not too large for the maintenance of his property and his personal expenses. The House of Lords Committee recommend that limited owners should be permitted to spend trust money upon the improvement of their estates on redeemable mortgage, and also to charge their estates for improvements for a period of ten years longer than the owner's expectation of life, on receiving a certificate from the Court of Chancery or the Enclosure Commissioners to the effect that the improvement is beneficial to the estate; but this certificate may be dispensed with if the limited owner acts with the consent of the tenant-in-tail, being of full age. Since this Report was published, powers have been given to limited owners by the *Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875*, to charge their estates with the sums paid to their tenants as compensation for unexhausted improvements of the first class, which include draining and erecting buildings, provided that these improvements add to the 'letting value' of the holding; but the recommendations of the committee have not been carried into effect. They appear to be of considerable value and importance, but, unless the limited owner has his power of sale extended in some manner as we have already suggested, he cannot but labour

under disadvantages in executing improvements. It is not, however, to be supposed that entailed estates are, as a rule, less well managed than those which are held in fee. Experienced witnesses stated in their evidence to the committee already referred to, that in this respect they could, as a general rule, detect but little difference between the two kinds of estates; and this, we believe, will be the experience of every impartial observer.

To increase or even to maintain the productiveness of the soil, good cultivation is at least as necessary as permanent improvements; without it, indeed, these improvements are too often rendered ineffective. This at once leads us to consider the position of the cultivators or occupiers.

They hold their farms under a variety of tenures. In Scotland leases for nineteen years have for many years been the almost invariable custom. South of the Tweed leases prevail in some districts, and written yearly agreements in others; but one-half of the kingdom, according to Mr. C. S. Reed, is occupied by tenants-at-will, who can be turned out of their holdings after receiving a six months' notice, and are entitled to no compensation, except in some districts, such as Lincolnshire, where a tenant-right custom prevails. The Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, has improved matters in the farms which are not excluded from its operation, by extending the period of the notice to quit from six to twelve months, and by granting the tenant compensation for unexhausted improvements. The Act is not compulsory, and it is impossible to estimate the proportion of the tenancies which are subject to its provisions.

Now it is argued by the farmer and his friends that, in all but exceptional cases, he is discouraged from investing capital in the farm by the insecurity of his tenure, by ill-advised restrictions on his method of cultivation, or from the want of a sufficient guarantee that he will enjoy the full benefit of his outlay on agricultural improvements. The remedy usually suggested is the enactment of some compulsory measure. Limitation of the freedom of contract can only be justified on the grounds that one party to the contract is, from some mental, physical, or other incapacity, powerless to protect his own interests. On these grounds there is no more justification for interfering in agricultural than commercial or any other arrangements between individuals. The tenant is a free agent; he is not obliged to take a farm on terms of which he does not approve; he is presumably of full age; and if his mental capacity is sufficient to enable him to manage a farm, he will probably be able thoroughly to understand the terms

to which he gives his assent. But it is said that the competition for farms is so intense that the applicants will agree to any terms. It is possible that the intensity of this competition has somewhat diminished of late, but even if it has not, we cannot see that it affords any argument for legislative interference.

As to insecurity of tenure, it can scarcely be denied that a tenancy-at-will is theoretically as insecure a tenure as could well be imagined. Agricultural processes take time to mature. Improvements of the most limited kind can only yield a return after the lapse of some months or even years; and yet the tenant is exposed to the risk of having to quit his farm at the end of six months. But the practical effect of this tenure on agriculture is much less serious. Tenants-at-will are rarely disturbed; they may be found occupying the same farm from generation to generation, without any more fear of having to leave it than if they were the actual proprietors. It is, in fact, generally admitted that farms held in this manner are let at lower rents and change hands less frequently than farms let on long leases. In the latter case the term is fixed, and its expiration gives an opportunity for a new arrangement to be made. It is a transaction based on commercial principles; while the tenant-at-will, as the name implies, depends absolutely on the nod of his landlord. Instances of the abuse of this power are few and far between. It appears to us, however, desirable in agricultural contracts, as in all other transactions, that the terms should be in writing, whether they take the form of a lease or of an agreement. There is much to be said for both these forms of tenancy. The landlord and tenant may be equally disinclined to bind themselves by an arrangement which is to last for a definite number of years; the landlord may wish to know something more of the qualifications of his tenant, and the tenant may desire to test the capabilities of his farm. But every energetic farmer should, we think, ultimately aim at acquiring a lease for a sufficient term to enable him thoroughly to develop the resources of his land without any chance of disturbance. The covenants of a lease are of no less importance. It was customary a few years ago to bind down the tenant to a prescribed mode of cultivation. He was prohibited from selling hay or straw off his farm; he was forbidden to take two white crops in succession; the rotation of his crops was laid down for him; and all sorts of covenants were inserted, many of which were at variance with the rules of modern husbandry, and almost all of them were either futile or injurious. However, the harm done by some of these restrictions cannot have

been very serious. At present prices few tenants would think of breaking up old pasture or taking successive corn crops; and though it may answer near a town to sell hay and straw, and purchase town manure, this is not a system which could be generally adopted; if it were, the hay and straw would decrease, and manure would increase in value, to the great benefit of the towns, but not of the producers. But if the old leases erred in their excessive restrictions, the farmer's demand for absolute freedom of cultivation errs in the other direction. If the tenant is entitled to protect himself against a capricious or unfair landlord, the landlord is equally entitled to protect himself against an ignorant or an unprincipled tenant. The landlord's fixed capital in land and buildings may generally be taken as worth four times as much as the tenant's working capital, and it is, moreover, liable to deterioration from bad treatment. For instance, a tenant enters upon a farm in high condition, and then he proceeds to 'farm it out,' that is, he takes as much out of the land and puts as little into it as he can; and at the end of his term he leaves it in a foul and exhausted condition. He may have made large profits by these means, but the landlord's property is so much depreciated in value that if he can let the farm at all it is only at a reduced rent; and the community at large is injuriously affected in so far as the productiveness of the soil is impaired. Such cases are neither imaginary nor very rare, and every prudent landowner must guard himself against them. In the case of tenancies-at-will or of yearly agreements, he has always the power of ridding himself of an unsatisfactory tenant before any great amount of injury is done. In leases the problem is how to prevent a bad tenant from doing mischief, and at the same time to allow the improving tenant to use his own discretion as to the best mode of conducting his business. Lord Leicester appears to have solved this problem in a satisfactory manner. His ordinary lease is for a term of twenty years; it contains no restrictive covenants as to methods of cultivation or disposal of produce; power is reserved to interpose if this freedom is misused; and at the expiration of sixteen years a new arrangement is made; either the lease is renewed for another term of twenty years, or, if it is not, the tenant is bound during the last four years of his term to bring his farm into the ordinary four-course system, with proper conditions for payment for unexhausted manures. The succeeding tenant then enters upon a farm which he can at once proceed to work profitably without any break in the course of its cultivation.

The third of these farmer's questions relates to 'unexhausted

‘improvements.’ The use of the word ‘improvement’ is somewhat misleading. Improvements which add to the permanent value of the freehold, and which are enumerated under the head of improvements of the first class in the *Agricultural Holdings Act*, are invariably executed by the landlord. If the tenant undertakes them without the consent of the landlord, he is by that act precluded from claiming compensation. In any case it would be the height of imprudence for him to make any considerable outlay without some previous agreement for compensation. The so-called improvements of the second and third class, such as liming, chalking, or marling land, or the use of manures or food for cattle, are agricultural operations in the usual course of husbandry, and are more or less transitory in their effects. They are necessarily the tenant’s affair; and if he quits his farm before he has reaped the full benefit of his outlay, he is in justice entitled to compensation in proportion to his expenditure, the landlord on his side being protected against unreasonable and extortionate claims. This protection is no less required in the interest of the incoming tenant, who has, in the usual course of business, to pay the compensation to his predecessor; a heavy bill for an unnecessary or unprofitable outlay would seriously hamper him at the very time when a command of capital is most important. It is no less to the advantage of the landlord that the tenant should be thus compensated, whether he holds under lease or agreement. He will not then hesitate to keep his farm in good condition up to the end of his term, and he certainly will not do this if his successor is to have all the advantage of his outlay. The change of the presumption of law, introduced by the *Agricultural Holdings Act*, is one of the most useful and beneficial provisions of that measure; and though its adoption is not compulsory, it has, even where it has not been adopted, caused landlords to insert compensating clauses in their own leases and agreements.

We have briefly stated the farmer’s case, and we have pointed out in what particulars he has just cause for complaint. At the same time we are very doubtful whether the circumstances to which we have referred have to any considerable extent impeded the investment of capital in the soil. In spite of insecurity of tenure and restrictive covenants, the working capital of the British farmers in proportion to area far exceeds that of any other nation. Mr. Caird estimates it for the United Kingdom at 400,000,000*l.*; allowance must be made for Ireland, which is included in this estimate. This capital is in its entirety available for purposes of cultivation. Large as the

amount is, we are constantly told that a great deal more is required. There are doubtless many tenants whose capital is insufficient to enable them to do justice to the farms which they hold; this is especially the case on poor soils, where economy in buildings has induced landlords, in some instances unwisely, to substitute large for small holdings. But farms of this description would not, under the most favourable circumstances, attract capitalists. If the land would yield a fair return to a much larger amount of capital than is now employed in its cultivation, capital would have found its way to it in spite of all the alleged impediments. It is, we believe, a fallacy to suppose that by doubling the agricultural capital the produce of the soil may also be doubled. There is a limit to high farming, as there is to everything else; beyond a certain point, which varies with different soils and other conditions, the outlay of capital is not rewarded with a proportionately increased yield. Mr. Reed quoted, in the House of Commons, Mr. Lawes' opinion, that 'the increase of crops is not in proportion to the increase of manure.' There is indeed some doubt whether the wholesale use of artificial manures, which stimulate the soil to yield extraordinary crops, has not in the end an exhausting effect on the land. It is further to be remarked that, in the present depression, the largest and best farmers have, as a rule, been the greatest sufferers. In ordinary years their profits are realised by the abundant produce which results from a large outlay of capital; but latterly the unfavourable seasons have beaten them as well as their smaller brethren, and their losses have been in proportion to their outlay. Instances without end could be adduced to prove this assertion. The inference to be drawn from them is, not that good farming is unremunerative, but that the depression is due to exceptional causes which have neutralised its natural effects, and is not due to the deficiency of capital invested in cultivation.

Without attempting to cover the whole ground of this vast subject, we have reviewed, as fully as our space admits, the main questions which affect the agriculture of this country. We have endeavoured to prove that the depression from which we are suffering cannot be attributed to any inherent defects in our agricultural system, which, tested by its results, compares favourably with that of any other country in the world; it cannot therefore be remedied by the organic changes which some 'land reformers' would desire to introduce. Like all other human institutions, this system is not perfect; it is capable of reform in regard both to ownership and tenancy. Some of these reforms may require the intervention of the Legislature,

the larger part of them may best be left to the operation of natural and economic laws; but any attempts artificially to regulate the size of estates or of holdings must inevitably result in failure, or in confusion and mischief.

It is difficult to forecast the future of agriculture. We may reasonably anticipate a break in the persistent monotony of unfavourable seasons, which we hold to be by far the most important cause of the existing distress. Foreign competition, on the other hand, must be regarded as a permanent element in our calculations. Though its increasing intensity may be modified by the causes already described, it cannot but exercise a powerful influence on the character of our crops and methods of cultivation.

Farmers will have to consider what kinds of produce will yield them the best returns. They at present have a practical monopoly in the supply of milk and of hay and straw for the use of the towns—articles which, from their perishable nature or from their bulk, cannot be transported from distant localities. One-half of our consumption of butter and cheese is now derived from abroad, and it would seem that, by better management, some portion at any rate of the 15,000,000*l.*, which we annually pay for these supplies, might be intercepted by the home producer. It has been often suggested that more attention should be paid to the production of poultry and eggs, of vegetables and fruits of all kinds. Fruit-growing has proved very profitable in parts of Cornwall, of Perthshire, and of Kent, where it has been cultivated on a large scale. The consumption and importation of these articles are rapidly increasing, and their production might be advantageously extended on farms, where the circumstances of soil, climate, and facilities of communication are favourable to it. But the consumption, though increasing, is limited, and the cost of production is large; it is not impossible to overstock the market; and even if we produced at home all that we now receive from abroad, we should, according to Mr. Caird's calculations, only add two per cent. to our total agricultural produce. Market gardening, moreover, requires great skill, assiduity, and a large capital. The capital required to work a French vegetable garden of two acres is said to exceed 500*l.*

There remains the production of bread and meat, on which the prosperity of our farmers must mainly depend. That wheat will, in fairly favourable circumstances, continue to pay the cultivator, we have no doubt, but the area of its production, which has been reduced of late years, will probably be still further contracted, unless the inferior qualities can be profitably used

as cattle food; barley and oats, which from their lower price can less easily bear the cost of transport, may to a certain extent take its place; but it is likely that a considerable extent of the heavy clay lands will cease to be tilled. This is a result which cannot be contemplated without regret, for poor soils form bad and sometimes almost valueless pastures; and in any case, after their conversion into pasture, they will support a much smaller number of animals than they do at present, and the agricultural wealth of the country will suffer a decided loss.

As to meat, it is impossible to speak with confidence, but it appears to us that our position is more secure. Freight must always act as a natural protection. The railways, for which we are now supplying materials, will, it is true, open out new pastures in the far West; but having regard to the cost of the land transport, and to the increasing consumption on both sides of the Atlantic, the English farmers, though they cannot hope for a continued rise, need not anticipate a serious decline in price; and it is to be remembered that meat has, during the last ten years, increased in price more rapidly than its cost of production.

These questions can only be solved by practical experience; they must be left to work themselves out in accordance with circumstances. The prospects do not justify despair. In former times of distress, prophecies, even more gloomy than those to which we have lately listened, were made only to be refuted by events. It will require patience on the part of the farmers to bear, and more than one favourable season to repair, the losses which they have suffered. In the meantime both owners and occupiers of land will have to contract their personal expenses, and hopefully, but resolutely, to combine their efforts to meet the difficulties of their present position.

ART. II.—*The Life of J. M. W. Turner, R.A.* By PHILIP GILBERT HAMERTON. London: 1879.

IN Mr. Hamerton's 'Life of Turner' we have at length a book which may be welcomed by admirers of the great painter who will not allow their enthusiasm to make them unreasonable, as well as by all who are chiefly anxious that the achievements of a long and memorable career should be impartially judged and rightly estimated. Some perhaps may regard as spurious an enthusiasm which is ready to be convinced that the object of its worship is not flawless, and may treat all adverse criticism as evidence of a deliberate design to mar a great reputation. But among those to whom Turner's works have afforded the deepest and most unfailing enjoyment there are probably not a few who can look on this vehement and almost fanatical feeling as a transitional state through which they have themselves passed, and can treat it, therefore, with patient forbearance; and perhaps these are likely to be the best judges of a man who has certainly taken his place among the foremost painters of all ages and countries. The opinion of such men is the growth of years. It is the result not of the reading of books, of controversy, or of prejudice, but of living in the painter's works, following the guidance of his thoughts, and yielding to the spell of his genius with a spirit ready to sacrifice everything except the paramount duty of honest thought and the honest expression of thought. Mr. Ruskin is not the only man to whom the work of Turner has come almost as the revelation of a new world. Many must still remember the feelings of wonder and delight with which they fed upon his pictures as on the wisdom of a teacher whose like they had not come across before—a teacher who could transform all things into images of tenderness, beauty, and glory, and who seemed to interpret to them their own thoughts and give shape and reality to their dim and faint conceptions. The remembrance of these wonderful impressions, which seemed as though they could never be weakened, may go back to a time long before the publication of the first volume of 'Modern Painters;' and it was only because others were impressed almost or quite as deeply as himself that the 'Oxford Graduate' found an audience. Like that chivalrous champion, they had given themselves to the witchery of Turner's pencil, and wandered with him in enchanted land. In the mere outlines thrown off by him in a few minutes, not less, perhaps even more, than in his most

elaborate works, they found a wealth of thought, of power, and of expression, such as they failed, or fancied that they failed, to meet with elsewhere; and they resigned themselves to the enjoyment thus lavishly provided without caring to analyse their feelings except in directions where the analysis could only make their enthusiasm more intense. There were many such directions. The workings of the master mind might be traced from drawings which scarcely went beyond contrasts of light and shade, through others which exhibited little more than a monotone of hue with a bright spot or patch of colour here and there, to others in which the traditional methods were seen to be weakened, and at last were flung aside altogether. These stages in the development of his genius they were ready to follow, as they thought, with a discrimination which might deserve to be called judicial; but, while they could admit that here and there a fault or defect might mar the perfection of the work, they yet felt assured that the teachings of the new prophet became in each stage not only more striking and impressive, but more truthful. The conviction that Turner was charged with a special mission, and that he was conscious of it, gained strength as the years went by; and this mission, it was thought, impelled him to give a transcript of Nature in all her various aspects with a completeness such as none had aimed at or even conceived before him. His works exhibited, indeed, a range so vast, a perception so exquisitely delicate, a force of treatment so marvelously sustained, as even to justify the idolatry of his admirers, and it was to the feeling thus excited that Mr. Ruskin appealed against the perversity or blindness of those who refused to acknowledge their perfection, laying down at the same time canons of criticism which could not fail to lower the work of all other painters as much as they exalted that of Turner. There was one department of art in which Turner had no rival, and in which even the most extravagant praises would scarcely seem exaggerated. It was easy to take a series of his water-colour drawings, and from twenty or thirty of them to show the power with which he could exhibit, with some approach to their full glory, the most dazzling, the most majestic, and the most solemn aspects of nature at all hours of the day and in all seasons of the year. It was easy to analyse picture by picture, and to show that every hill, crag, and scar was full of the truth of mountain form, and that each displayed the same faithful study and representation of clouds and water. The only question which might awaken some misgivings in the mind even of enthusiasts would relate not to Turner's mastery

of mountain forms or effects of sky and water generally, but to the degree in which the features of any given sketch were faithful to those of the place depicted—in other words, whether and how far his sketches were truthful representations of actual places, and could honestly be called by their names. If once this question forced itself on their minds, the result might not weaken their power of discerning and valuing all that is beautiful in the works of Turner; but it would most assuredly deal a death-blow to some unreasoning sentiment and dispel the glamour of some over-ardent worship.

This question, which goes to the root of all art criticism, and compels us to determine, if it be possible, the nature and objects of art in itself, has led Mr. Hamerton to a patient examination of the life and career of Turner, in comparison with which Mr. Thornbury's biography of the great painter is little more than a collection of facts and incidents put together without any deep insight into the man or his work. He writes with the simplicity and transparent clearness of one who has thoroughly thought out the matters with which he deals, and who has reached some very positive conclusions and convictions which yet he has not the least wish to force on others, unless in their turn they are convinced of their reasonableness and their truth. The result, in reference to Mr. Ruskin's criticism, is a certain amount of iconoclasm; but, if Mr. Hamerton brushes aside some fancies which have no solid ground to rest on, it may be said that he leaves Turner's true fame on a surer foundation and in a clearer light than ever. It must always be worth while to try and see every man as he is; it can never be worth while to insist on seeing him as he is not, and we may safely say that Mr. Hamerton has made it impossible for any who are not prepared to distort or to suppress facts to see Turner as in all respects the wonderful being which he appears to be in Mr. Ruskin's overwrought eulogies.

These eulogies have been reiterated with so much persistency and so much success that an unprejudiced examination of them becomes a matter of duty; and the thanks of all who prefer the truth of facts where this truth is indispensably necessary are due to Mr. Hamerton for the straightforward honesty with which he has allowed facts to speak for themselves. Mr. Ruskin seems to be hurried away by the vehement zeal of a crusader. In taking up Turner's cause he demands sympathy for him on the score of imaginary wrongs, and challenges the admiration of everyone for acts of generosity for which, to say the least, it would be difficult to adduce any

satisfactory evidence. Turner, it seems, had lent some money to the widow of a drawing-master, from whom, when she tendered it, he refused to receive repayment, bidding her keep the money and to send her children to school and to church. 'He said this in bitterness,' remarks Mr. Ruskin, who tells the tale; 'he had himself been sent to neither.' But, in fact, Turner had been at schools in Brentford, in London, and in Margate. The time which he spent in these schools was not less than three years, and when he left the Margate school he was fully thirteen years of age. It is in a high degree unlikely that the masters of these schools would fail to take their pupils to some place of worship, however poor may have been the results of their discipline and instruction in the case of a boy so singularly gifted in some directions and so strangely dull in others as was Turner. He was seemingly incapable of learning any language except his own, and even English he could scarcely either write or speak. But having thus visited the sins or failings of the pupil on his teachers, Mr. Ruskin pleads for him as a victim of general unkindness, injustice, and even cruelty, in words so remarkable that, with Mr. Hamerton, we feel bound to quote them.

'Imagine,' says Mr. Ruskin to his hearers at Edinburgh, 'what it was for a man to live seventy years in this hard world, with the kindest heart and the noblest intellect of his time, and never to meet with a single word or ray of sympathy until he felt himself sinking into his grave. From the time he knew his true greatness all the world was turned against him; he held his own, but it would not be without roughness of bearing and hardening of the temper, if not of the heart. No one understood him, no one trusted him, and everyone cried out against him. Imagine, any of you, the effect on your own minds, if every voice that you heard from the human beings around you was raised year after year through all your lives only in condemnation of your efforts and denial of your success.'

This outburst of purely rhetorical indignation is, in effect, the assertion that Turner experienced nothing but neglect and obloquy until, towards the end of his life, Mr. Ruskin came forward as his champion. It is, however, in the very teeth of the facts. Many years before Turner's death, Mr. Hamerton remarks, Sir Robert Peel and others subscribed a sum of 5,000*l.* for the purpose of buying two of his pictures for the National Gallery, but the painter refused to part with the pictures selected. Some years before this great compliment was paid to him Lockhart had spoken of him as the first of all living landscape painters, and Walter Scott himself, not entirely agreeing with the popular taste, had described him as

being all the fashion. But in truth his whole career had been marked by a singularly steady and sustained success. His reputation since his death is certainly greater than that to which he attained in his lifetime; but this may be said of almost all great men in any art or any calling. At an age when most boys are at school his drawings were admitted into the exhibitions of the Royal Academy; nay, if Mr. Hamerton be right in saying that his first picture was exhibited in 1787, when he was twelve years old, Turner must still have been a schoolboy himself when the way to fame and prosperity as a painter was thus opened before him. Twelve years later, when he was only twenty-four, he was elected an Associate of the Academy, and he was a full Academician at twenty-seven. These distinctions were not bestowed for any brilliant displays of precocious genius. The development of Turner's powers within his own province was slow, and beyond it he can scarcely be said to have had any powers at all; but he was indefatigably industrious, his touch was astonishingly exact and firm, his rapidity of execution marvellous, his sense of light and shade as strong as it was delicate, and all these qualities had recommended his work as especially suited for reproduction in engravings, thus laying surely the foundations of the great pecuniary success, which he might, had he chosen, have made vastly greater. Far from languishing in hopeless neglect or obscurity, Turner might, indeed, with more truth, be regarded as a special favourite of fortune, happy in the time and the place of his birth, happy in the circumstances which gradually unfolded his powers by gradually enlarging the area for their exercise, happy in the wonderful vigour of his bodily constitution and in the sober and steady habits which reduced even real hardships to matters of thorough insignificance, and not less happy in his special calling from the very depth of incapacity which he betrayed for attaining the least success in any other. In his own province there was nothing which he shrank from taking in hand, and on whatever he undertook he invariably put out his full power. He could pass from the delineation of the grandest mountain forms to that of a dwelling-house or of a farmyard with its pigs and its poultry, and this uniformly careful and conscientious work obtained for him the confidence of all who entrusted him with commissions. His progress may not have been astonishingly rapid, but it was never interrupted. He had scarcely passed the threshold of manhood before he made himself so far independent as to be able to carry out his own theories without heeding the criticisms of a public whom he regarded as incapable of judging

them, and long before he reached middle life he had amassed a fortune which, for a man with an almost savage simplicity of habits, was vast wealth. To a great extent, therefore, he could educate the public whose criticism he despised, and live the singularly enviable life of a painter who has nothing to hinder him from cultivating with perfect freedom a genius within its own circuit transcendent.

But when Mr. Ruskin, on the strength of this undoubted genius, speaks of Turner as the noblest intellect of his time, he opens a question to which it is of real importance that we should have the proper and true answer. Turner's pictures might display an exquisitely delicate perception of the subtlest gradations in form and colour. They might furnish images of absolute repose such as no other painter had perhaps ever conceived, or of savage grandeur such as the Poussins could never have surpassed; they might exhibit the working of thoughts involving certain reflexions on the order and conditions of society or on the general government of the world. But are we to infer from this that he was a poet, a philosopher, or a theologian, and as illustrious in these capacities as for his power of handling the brush and the pencil? In other words, is genius, or at all events genius such as Turner's, the exaggeration of one particular faculty, or an extraordinary development of the mental faculties generally? There seems to be no doubt, in this instance, as to the answer. He spoke little and wrote little even in English; in any other language he neither wrote nor spoke at all. He visited the most lovely and the most magnificent scenes in Europe; but his sketches are the only records of his thoughts. He kept no journal, he sent no letters to his friends, or none which contained anything more than references to passing incidents. He could not spell, and his strange ignorance of common things might justify the conclusion that schooling had been entirely thrown away upon him, until we see that it had given him that insight into the history of his own land and of other countries, and that sense of geography, without which he might have lacked all stimulus of curiosity, and have stagnated in contented obscurity all his days. But Turner thought that he could write both in prose and in verse; and the results in both were sufficiently astonishing. He could discourse on art and ethics after the following wonderful fashion:—

‘They wrong virtue, enduring difficulties or worth in the bare imitation of nature, all offers received in the same brain; but where these attempts rise above mediocrity it would surely not be a little sacrifice to those who perceive the value of the success to foster it by

terms as cordial that cannot look so easy a way as those spoken of convey doubts to the expecting individual. For as the line that unites the beautiful to grace, and these offerings forming a new style, not that soul can guess as ethics. Teach them of both; but many serve the body and the soul, and but presume more as the beacon to the headland, which would be a warning to the danger of mannerism and to the disgustful.'

It is, of course, impossible to attach the faintest meaning to this bundle of sentences, or to any part of them; but even when we can follow the general drift of his ideas, the construction, or rather the disorder and confusion, of his sentences, is amazing. Of such half-intelligible utterances Mr. Hamerton gives the following specimen. Turner is speaking of reflexions in water, and he says:—

'Reflexions not only appear darker, but larger than the object which occasions them, and if the ripple or hollow of the wave is long enough to make an angle with the eye, it is on these undulating lines that the object reflects, and transmits all perpendicular objects lower towards the spectator; but in receding lines as well as objects, rules seem to lose their power, and those guides that enable us to find some cause for near objects lose their power or become enfeebled by contraction in remote ones. It has been asserted that all appear equal from the base line of the water; but these axioms I dissent from. It is true that by placing the eye equal to the water, it comes up to the rules laid down; but when the water is ruffled on which all things are to be reflected, it is no longer in right angles, but, according to the elevation of the spectator, becomes more or less an angle of incidence. If the undulating surface of the liquid did not, by current or motion, congregate forms, there would be no difficulty in simplifying the rules.'

It may be safely said that a man who is unable to express his meaning in plain words is a man of untrained mind. In writing down the first sentence of this passage, Turner probably did not intend to make a statement which, put as a universal, is manifestly not true. Reflexions are not always either larger or darker than the objects from which they are thrown; and no one knew this better than Turner himself. But in spite of this he speaks of contingent facts as if they depended on rules admitting of no exceptions, and then converts into a conditional proposition a statement which ought to be unqualified. All ripples are long enough to make an angle with the eye, and so to lengthen the reflexions of upright objects: hence, after an awkward fashion, it is true to say that this effect follows on the occurrence of ripples of sufficient length, because all ripples are of sufficient length. But having written a few lines in which some meaning may be seen, Turner passes on into the regions of nonsense. He ex-

presses his dissent from 'axioms' which assert 'that all appear equal from the base line of the water.' What the things are which so seem equal, and whether by the base line of the water he means the exact water level, he does not tell us; but Turner was aware that, if he did mean this, and if his 'all' meant 'all reflexions,' they were certainly equal, because to the eye which rests exactly on the water level there can be no reflexions at all. When he adds that 'by placing the eye equal to the water it comes up to the rules laid down,' he verges on absurdity. The fact seems to be that Turner, full of confidence in his genius as a painter, was quite unconscious of his ignorance of most things lying beyond his sphere. It was this ignorance which led him to form a false estimate of the functions of art, and made him indignant with the public generally because they failed to perceive that the painter of the '*Liber Studiorum*' wished his drawings to be regarded as sermons or prophecies, and never to be inspected except as a consecutive series. A notion so preposterous would never have entered into the head of a man who had even a faint sense of proportion. With such discernment he must have felt that the conveying of direct moral reproof or warning is not, and cannot be, the object of art, and, as Mr. Hamerton puts it, that the lessons which he intended to convey by his pictures 'might be much better expressed in a few words of written English than by any quantity of landscape design.'

It is unfortunate that Mr. Ruskin should have been led away by Turner's conceits into a parading of the deep moral lessons to be derived from sketches of almost unrivalled beauty and strength, and into something like a justification of the contemptuous anger with which the painter is said to have treated the efforts of those who wished to get copies of some particular subject as more beautiful than the rest. The remark of Turner, that there could be no use in them but together, merely betrayed his lack of education: in Mr. Ruskin this misconception of the purpose of art is not so easily excused. But Turner's ambition, never subjected to any checks or restraints, tempted him into flights of poetry, remarkable for the huge incapacity for improvement of which they furnish the most ample and melancholy evidence. Singing the praises of the men employed in the preventive service, Turner could string together such pitiable doggerel as the following :—

'To guard the coast their duty, not delude
By promises as little heeded as they're good ;

When strictly followed, give a conscious peace—
And ask at the eve of life a just release.
But idleness, the bane of every country's weal,
Equally enervates the soldier and his steel.'

The task of laying bare the weaknesses of a great genius is not an agreeable one, but it must often be undertaken in the interests of truth, and the duty of so doing becomes paramount when the false impressions left by unguarded and excessive eulogies are likely to be especially mischievous. Illusions are seldom beneficial; here they can only lead us to false conceptions of the painter's character and of the life which made him what he was. Mr. Hamerton gives some other specimens from the abundant quarry of Turner's verse; but although the painter may here and there blunder into a line which would not disgrace a stupid schoolboy, they all point to the conclusion that his powers were singularly weak, except on his own special ground. Here, it is true, they raised him into a new world, into which many are as unable to follow him as he was to express himself intelligibly in words. But the same may be said of great musicians, and of the witchery over which they have supreme command. There is in their strains, as Cardinal Newman told his hearers years ago at Oxford, something which we can neither compass nor utter, although mortal man, and he perhaps not otherwise gifted above his fellows, has the power of eliciting them. So, beyond doubt, it is with Turner. His works, as we look on them, can scarcely fail to excite those strange yearnings for distant ideals which the old Hebrew prophet embodied in the promise, 'Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty, and behold the land that is very far off;' nor can we venture to deny that such yearnings gave birth to the visions of loveliness or grandeur which he seemed to breathe out, mysteriously and without effort, upon his paper or his canvas. But without his brush or pencil the great painter was as weak as Samson with his locks shorn; and if his career proves anything, it proves, in Mr. Hamerton's words, that artistic genius is a special faculty only.

The story of this strange career is soon told, and Mr. Hamerton has wisely given it with great simplicity. In some of its aspects it is by no means inviting. If in his earlier years he might have been modelled after the common type of men, and trained into the ways and habits of ordinary life, the chance seemed to be irretrievably lost almost before he had passed the threshold of manhood. Disappointment in love, we are told, made him abandon definitely all thoughts of marriage, and thenceforth he lived two lives which had ap-

parently little in common. The one was the life of his art, a life of exquisite refinement, of the widest range, of the most perfect sensibility, and the keenest powers of insight and imagination; and it was a life which he passed in the most absolute solitude. The other was the coarse and boorish life in which he found such enjoyments as commend themselves to the lower appetites of humanity. In the one he was a poet, worthy, in Mr. Hamerton's judgment, to be compared closely with Dante and Shelley; in the other he exhibited, as Mr. Hamerton tersely and trenchantly puts it, 'a nature which was 'something between those of a common sailor and a costermonger,' and in which external rudeness was combined with a desire for low pleasure and a passion for small gains. So astonishing is the contrast, and so completely distinct are the two currents of his existence, that the picture of such a character might in fiction be well pronounced incredible. But the fact of the contrast is indisputable; and with it we might take into account the towering ambition which made the mind of Turner so fertile in bold and even daring schemes for creating and establishing his fame. From the first he had been an unwearied and ready workman. No task seemed above him from its difficulty, none beneath him from its meanness. He went through the land on foot, doing the work with which he was charged, and laying up a vast mass of notes on which his imagination fed itself after his return to his town abode. While he was still scarcely more than a youth, he had visited and sketched many of our most important cities and buildings; he had filled his mind with a wealth of impressions derived from all the various kinds of scenery to be found in England and Wales, from our hills and streams, our heaths and moors, our coasts and harbours. From the first his works furnished occupation for the engravers, and Turner soon discovered the power of the instrument of which he thus acquired command. A few more years passed away, leaving him more and more independent in means, and more bent on measuring himself against painters with whom the mere thought of rivalry might seem unpardonable presumption. At the age of thirty-three he determined to enter the lists with Claude, whose 'Liber Veritatis' was to be outdone by his own 'Liber Studiorum.' The conditions of the contest were perhaps not altogether fair. On the one side was a living painter, capable of choosing the subjects in which he was to show himself superior to Claude; on the other, in Mr. Hamerton's words, was 'a dead man, who had no idea that there was ever to be a contest at all, and had done his work for his private satisfac-

'tion.' The six divisions under which Turner arranged the plates in his book of studies prove how thoroughly he was aware of the wide range of his powers, while the separate heads, 'Pastoral' and 'Elegant Pastoral,' betrayed his inability to grasp the principles of true classification. Turner, as we have already remarked, insisted that the plates formed a complete and coherent whole, and was deeply offended with all who treated them as separate compositions, and yet the divisions of his work prove little more than the presence of this intention, for the titles do not always correspond to their contents. Purely mythical subjects, such as the 'Jason' and the 'Procris and Cephalus,' are included under the head of History, while the castles of Norham and Raglan appear respectively in the classes Pastoral and Elegant Pastoral. But, whatever may have been the faults or the pretentiousness of his classifications, the drawings themselves were never undervalued, although they may not have led all who admitted and took delight in their power, beauty, and variety, to Mr. Ruskin's conclusion that Turner was the only man who had ever given 'an entire transcript of the whole system of nature,' and was therefore 'the only perfect landscape-painter whom 'the world has ever seen.' It was not, however, in the power of Turner more than in that of anyone else to perform impossibilities; and the complete transcript of the infinite phenomena of nature is, as Mr. Hamerton has well remarked, a task altogether beyond the highest genius of finite man. But even such praise as this failed to satisfy the painter; and it failed to do so probably because he was conscious of its exaggeration. He despised the opinion of critics who were not technically artists; but no one was ever more keenly anxious to adopt every device which might keep his name before them. Among these devices, that of rivalry with Claude seems to have taken a peculiar hold on his mind. In the number of the pictures which he had resolved on bequeathing to the nation were the 'Building of Carthage' and the 'Sun rising in Mist.' The former was one of those artificial compositions with classical architecture in which even Mr. Ruskin confesses himself unable to see any special merit. It has suffered already from the experiments which Turner was constantly making in the use of his pigments, and the sky in particular is growing more heavy and opaque; but the picture is still striking and impressive, and the great tree which reposes against the burning heaven, with its vast shadow thrown across the underwood and the buildings beneath it, is magnificent. The 'Sun rising in Mist' is a picture far more worthy of Turner's genius. It is

what it professes to be. The sun, still veiled in the vapours of the lower air, is flushing the clouds which tower above it, and lighting with reflected splendour the tranquil sea on which float mighty war ships and the busy and bustling fishing smacks, while the beach is enlivened by groups of fishermen engaged in sorting the fish, which furnish points of wonderful colour for the foreground. By the directions of his will these two pictures are hung between the two paintings of Claude known as 'The Seaport' and 'The Mill.' Probably neither of these pictures displays the vast power and the wide range of conception exhibited by his more modern antagonist; but the former is as light, sparkling, and transparent, as the 'Building of Carthage' is heavy, hot, and oppressive; and between the latter and the picture which stands beside it no comparison is even possible. The one is in mist, the other in clear daylight. The one is a sea piece, the other an extensive Italian landscape with groups of trees. 'There is not a tree in the Turner,' adds Mr. Hamerton, 'there is not a sail in the Claude. Turner has painted fog, Claude a clear atmosphere. The sun is in Turner's picture, and it is out of Claude's. So we have to compare sails with trees, and the sea with an inland landscape, and the sun with a summer cloud, and a mill with a man-of-war. May the critics of future generations get much benefit by these comparisons!'

It would be more important, if it were only possible, to determine the place which should be assigned to Turner among the painters of England and Europe, and to ascertain the means by which his reputation has been achieved. On neither point has Mr. Ruskin any hesitation in expressing his judgment. Within the whole circle of art Turner is absolutely without a peer. 'We have had,' he says, 'living with us, and painting for us, the greatest painter of all time, a man with whose supremacy of power no intellect of past ages can be put in comparison for a moment.' Turner may not, indeed, have done everything, but all that he has done is the best that has ever been done. 'In all that he says we believe; in all that he does we trust. It is therefore that we pray him to utter nothing lightly, to do nothing regardlessly. He stands upon an eminence, from which he looks back over the universe of God and forward over the generations of men.' If this pre-eminence was won as Mr. Ruskin says that it was won, no one could venture to say that it was undeserved. According to him it was assured not by the beauty, the grace, the tenderness, or the force of his work, but notably by its truthfulness. There was, it is true, nothing feeble, or random, or

haphazard, in his touch or his treatment; but this decision, we are told, came chiefly of his truthfulness. 'It was because he meant always to be true that he was able always to be bold; and you will find that you may gain his courage if you will maintain his fidelity.' As to the meaning of these words Mr. Ruskin leaves us in no doubt. Turner was truthful in the sense in which the painters of the so-called Pre-Raphaelite school are truthful; nay, he was the true founder of the school as well as its head. The great principle of this school was, in the words of Mr. Ruskin himself, absolute truth 'obtained by working everything, down to the most minute detail, from nature, and from nature only.' It follows, as Mr. Hamerton remarks, that 'accurate portraiture of objects was a leading Pre-Raphaelite principle.' It is, therefore, of the first importance to ascertain whether this accurate portraiture of objects was recognised as a duty either by the theory or in the practice of Turner.

A large part of Mr. Hamerton's biography is occupied, directly or indirectly, with the discussion of this question, and the mode in which he has treated it constitutes perhaps the greatest merit of his volume. If the Pre-Raphaelite canon be true, and if it was a canon laid down by Turner himself, he must stand or fall by his own words, and the only means of testing him is by a comparison of some of his works with the scenes which they profess to represent. It is, of course, possible that the titles of some of his sketches and drawings may have been affixed to them by others without his knowledge or his sanction; but there remains still a vast multitude of pictures for which no such plea can be urged. The well-known drawing of Heidelberg, the foreground of which is filled with holiday-making students in fancy garb, is meant to be a drawing of Heidelberg; but the point to be determined is whether those who have never seen Heidelberg could obtain a right impression of it from the picture. It is simply impossible that they should do so. The effects of cloud and mist are probably such as, with the very moderate height of the hills, would be seen once or twice only in a generation; and although enfolding vapours may exaggerate the size of the hills round which they wrap themselves, the exaggeration could never go to the lengths here depicted. But the whole effect of the drawing depends on the luminous effulgence of the bridge, an effulgence which could be reflected only from unrippled and absolutely tranquil waters. Turner accordingly resorts to every device for imparting to the Neckar this character of profound repose. A groom has ridden on one horse and led an-

other almost into the mid-stream; women are washing linen, some at a distance of many feet or many yards from the shore; and the mighty castle is reflected in water which scarcely betrays the fact that it is moving at all. It is enough to say that all these devices are plain violations of fact. Of the fantastic attire of the students we need take no notice, although such a display would probably be not less astonishing on the banks of the Neckar than on those of the Thames; but the painting of the river in this drawing must be always and wholly false. The groom could never reach the spot where his horses are quietly standing; the washerwomen would be beyond their depth, or rather would be swept away by the current before they could get out of their depth; and the hurrying water could never delight the eye with the reflexions which give to the drawing its crowning charm. The place, as a whole, is not Heidelberg. Those who have not seen it will learn little about it from Turner's marvellously beautiful but wondrously untruthful sketch, and those who go thither in the hope that they too may come in for a like feast of beauty must be woefully disappointed, and be tempted to vent their wrath in plain-spoken comments on the untrustworthiness of their guide.

The 'Heidelberg' is a late drawing, but Mr. Hamerton devotes a chapter of his biography to the careful examination of a study of Kilchurn Castle made in 1801. His criticism is searching and exhaustive, and it should win for him the gratitude of all for whom truth is more precious than any form of hero worship. He has rightly chosen this subject, because his intimate local knowledge enables him to speak decisively with regard to all the features of the real place, and to compare them with the sketch of the painter.

'There is no scene in Europe more familiar to me than the head of Loch Awe, where Kilchurn Castle is situated. I have lived there for years, and know the topography of the place quite thoroughly, with that minuteness which is possible only to a resident who takes the keenest interest in the neighbourhood where he lives, and makes landscape-painting his main occupation, and walking and boating his amusements. This close intimacy with the place permits me to appreciate the exact degree in which Turner's topography is a deviation from the topography of the actual world; and the reader will perhaps think it not too great a demand upon his patience if I make the difference as clear as I can in this instance, for it is of the very utmost importance to our understanding of Turner's mature work, occurring as it does quite early in his manhood, and fixing the date of his emancipation from reality.'

This arraignment is certainly severe and serious, and vir-

tually it falls little short of a charge which should speak of Sir Joshua Reynolds's portrait of Dr. Johnson as bearing a closer resemblance to Warren Hastings, if it resembled anyone at all. Nor must it be forgotten that this charge is not directed against that nameless grace and dignity which the true painter may discern in objects before him, although they may be hidden from common eyes. Reynolds's portrait of Johnson must impress all who look on it, and although they may feel that the genius of a great artist has been at work upon it, the picture is yet in complete harmony with all that we know of the man, and even with the rougher likenesses drawn by other hands. The 'Parish Clerk' of Gainsborough may perhaps be idealised; and most assuredly it would not be given to every one to see all that Gainsborough saw in a man who might be regarded by his neighbours as commonplace enough. But in all likelihood these neighbours would have recognised the likeness at once, although they might have failed to see much more in the picture than they saw in the living man. In either case the value of the painting, if set forth as a likeness of Dr. Johnson or of a parish clerk, would in great measure depend on its fidelity to the objects portrayed, and a feeling of resentment might be excused if we were told or if we discovered that the so-called portrait of Johnson was not a portrait of Johnson at all. It might perhaps be hard to determine at what point precisely deviation from the truth of features would deprive it of its title to be called a likeness of the man in question. The painter would be fully justified in seizing and fixing upon his canvas the highest expression of which his subject was capable; but he would not be justified in changing all its outlines and tampering with its general character. Mr. Hamerton follows up this subject by an elaborate criticism of Turner's 'Kilchurn Castle,' which is certainly *not* the castle we all know on the banks of Loch Awe, but in these details it is needless to follow him.

It is quite possible that the scene in his picture may be altogether more impressive and magnificent than any which can strike the spectator's eye on the shores of Loch Awe or the banks of the Orchay; but it is beyond dispute that, as the supposed portraiture of a real place, it can have no value whatever for those who care for that place. If it be said that the painter cannot be expected to work for such persons, we enter on a question on which the future history of art may in great measure or even wholly depend; but, without going into it for the present, we cannot resist Mr. Hamerton's conclusion that 'the feelings of attachment to locality, which are often

‘so inextricably mingled with our admiration for natural beauty, ‘are hurt and wounded by Turner’s indifference to everything ‘that we know and love.’ Nor is it less true that the charge thus brought against Turner does not apply to works of other painters, which are yet full of beauty, although they may not perhaps be put into comparison with the handiwork of Turner. We think, however, that Mr. Hamerton has somewhat exaggerated this charge. Turner was inaccurate when his object was to make a picture with a peculiar effect; but he could be accurate enough when he chose. Few of his large oil pictures were painted on the spot they represent; but to take one which undoubtedly was so painted, the ‘Rome from Mount Aventine,’ lately in the Novar collection, nothing can be more precise and topographical. It is possible to trace in that canvas almost any street and building of note in Rome. It was wholly executed on the spot, and Turner sought to make it faithful.

When he departed from local truthfulness Turner generally had a purpose sufficiently justifying his audacious license, and this purpose we must presently consider. But undoubtedly from a very early stage in his career he regarded local fidelity as a thing worth nothing in comparison with certain other things at which he strenuously aimed. Nor can it be urged as an extenuating plea that he set aside topographical exactness for scientific accuracy of another sort. With incisive impartiality Mr. Hamerton asserts that Turner ‘never hesitated to become ‘utterly unscientific when his artistic instincts suggested that ‘kind of unfaithfulness.’ He dispensed at will with geological truth and with the rules of perspective. The lines of his buildings are seldom accurate, and sometimes, as in the drawing of St. Julian’s at Tours, impossible. His light and shade, though almost always beautiful, are generally arbitrary. His shadows are frequently untrue, and in many instances are out of all agreement with the position of the sun in his picture. He is as free—in other words, as inexact—in dealing with his foreground forms as with those in his distances. He will interpose between himself and near objects effects of atmospheric distance which perhaps no other eye than his ever beheld, but of which, in spite of all misgivings as to their truth, it is impossible not to acknowledge the charm.

In the same year in which Turner produced his ‘Building of Carthage’ he also painted a picture which some have ranked among his greatest works. ‘Crossing the Brook’ is, for many reasons, remarkable, but it is so chiefly as marking the point at which Turner entered into a new world with the consciousness that he possessed powers capable of winning in

it a series of splendid victories. This picture exhibits both the excellences and the defects of his genius. It is literally bathed in light, but in comparison with later works it is almost in monotone of colour. So wonderful indeed is its transparency, so touching the beauty of its sky and its distance, that the spectator may perhaps be at a loss to know why the feelings which it awakens in him are not those of unmixed satisfaction. There is abundant evidence of decision from one end of the work to the other; but in one part of it this decision has involved a sacrifice of truth which must mar the enjoyment of many who would far rather dwell on its beauties than on its flaws. There is vast strength in the drawing of the trees on the left-hand side; but the forms of the two which rise above the rest with their trunks close to each other are ungraceful, awkward, we feel tempted to say impossible. If they are redeemed from positive ugliness, it is by the adoption of an artifice suggested by the practice of Claude, an artifice which exaggerates the distance between near objects, as between the nearer and further branches of a tree. This device may be seen in a vast number of his pictures. It is pushed to its furthest extent in the great stone pine which towers up on the right-hand side in the 'Golden Bough'; it is seen in its most attractive form in the splendid group which throws out the glories of his evening sky in the Bay of Baïæ. But in 'Crossing the Brook' it fails to conquer the feeling of repulsion caused by the stiffness, or, to speak plainly, the untruthfulness, of the tree forms. We are not surprised when Mr. Hamerton tells us that these trees were painted from a slight pencil sketch, nor can we doubt that in point of accuracy the pencil sketch might be compared to his drawing of Kilchurn. Twelve years before this picture was painted Turner could scarcely be called a colourist. There were patches of colour in his drawings, and that was all. In 'Crossing the Brook' the colouring is still subdued, but there is colour in every part of it, and more particularly there is that astonishing depth of atmosphere which makes the eye reel as if we were looking down from a mountain summit over a vast and varied distance. From the higher ground on which the painter stands there stretches an almost boundless landscape, until at length the hills slope down to Plymouth Sound and the grey sea far off. It is perhaps strictly true that such distance had never been painted before; and Turner was fully aware of the fact.

On this picture Mr. Hamerton lays stress, as marking the transition from his earlier style to that of his maturity. It

may be instructive to compare it with a later work, of which Mr. Hamerton's estimate is perhaps too partial. The 'Phryne going to the Baths as Venus' is a picture of amazing elaborateness and delicacy, sparkling with the dazzling light of the pure Hellenic atmosphere, which transforms even the uncouth groups huddled together on the road into the graceful shapes which move in stately procession in the drama of Euripides—

*ἀεὶ διὰ λαμπροτάτου
βαίνοντες ἀβρῶς αἰθέρος.*

This painting is, in Mr. Hamerton's judgment, a magnificent instance of Turner's treatment of trees when his art was fully developed.

'I well remember,' he says, 'how the combined grace and energy of the branch drawing in this picture seemed to me, before I knew the forest of Fontainebleau, an idealisation of sylvan beauty beyond the possibilities of nature; and how, when I came almost directly from Fontainebleau to the National Gallery, I found in the picture the power, the freedom, the elegance which astonish us in the noblest Fontainebleau trees, and give the visitor to that wonderful place an entirely new conception of what sylvan magnificence may be. It is useless to expatiate further upon the subject, for no conception of the trees in the "Phryne" can be given without illustration, and even that, on a reduced scale, would be inadequate, as the picture itself is more than six feet high, and drawn with such delicate modulation in all its curves that every inch of it is a study. Again, the most subtle etching or engraving would fail to render adequately the play of light in the foliage and among the branches, not to speak of the elaborate distances, which are as full of material as they can be. The "Phryne" is certainly one of the very greatest pictures of Turner's full maturity. It was first exhibited in 1838, and shows signs of over-ripeness in the figures more than in anything else.'

This eulogy is surely exaggerated, unless, indeed, Mr. Hamerton, when he speaks of the magnificent treatment of the trees in this painting, is thinking chiefly of those which are clustered in the gardens beneath the more prominent groups in front. There are exquisite grace and lightness in the palm trees, across whose branches falls the line of luminous shadow which makes the foliage above it quiver with splendour. The blending of the more distant vegetation with the glistening marbles of the baths on the left hand, and the more sombre mass of buildings in the middle and on the right hand of the picture, is beyond all praise. Nor could the beauty of the white light, dazzling yet not oppressive, which is shed over hill and dale and the wide expanse of the lustrous lake which sleeps beneath, be well exceeded by the workmanship of any mortal hand. But we can scarcely suppose that Mr. Hamerton means his

words to apply to the pines which tower into the heaven on the left hand, or to the more confused group of trees on the extreme right. The shapes assumed by the former are as strange as any which Turner ever put upon canvas or paper; those of the latter, although bathed in the most exquisite tints, are flat, thin, and poor. The curves of many of the branches of the largest tree are impossible; and from head to foot the tree conveys only the impression of disease. These pines are, in fact, a reproduction, with all their faults intensified, of the pines in the 'Crossing the Brook.' For some time the two pictures were hung near each other; and the correspondence between them came out very forcibly. The conclusion is forced upon us that the earlier painting which marked the transition from his opaque to his luminous colouring was present to his mind in every part of his 'Phryne.' The plan of both the drawings is the same. In each there are the lonely pines to the left, and the closer thickets to the right, while the hills and valleys below, rich with a lavish wealth of vegetation, slope down towards an expanse of tranquil water in the distance. The likeness may be traced out in points of minute detail; but probably of those who have taken the trouble to make careful copies of both pictures none will hesitate to admit that the 'Phryne' is a transcript of 'Crossing the Brook' in the richest language of his later years.

The exhibition of the 'Phryne' in 1838 was followed in the next year by that of the 'Old Téméraire.' The artist's deliberate defiance or rejection of the truth of facts is shown here by the impossible light thrown on the ships, the sun and moon being where they are; but his purpose was to shed an unearthly lustre on the doomed vessel which is being tugged to its last berth, and in this his disregard of accuracy has enabled him to achieve a complete success. The subject is a melancholy one, and Turner felt it to be so. Whether he had any forebodings of the great revolution which has made the stately fabrics of our old warships of Nelson's age things of a past already receding into distance, we cannot say; but we owe a debt of gratitude to the illustrious painter who has preserved for us in all their beauty forms which in material reality will to coming generations be unknown. The picture is indeed a splendid poem, in which the glory of the old ship blends indescribably with the glory of a sun setting in the most gorgeous and yet sombre pomp. 'It sets,' Mr. Hamerton remarks, 'in red, and the red, by the artist's craft, is made at the same time both decided in hue and luminous—always a great technical difficulty.' The task was rendered easier, perhaps,

by the device of making the sun itself white, although the sight of a lustreless orb kindling the upper heaven into such conflagration as this would be, to say the least, most rare. This great work marks, in Mr. Ruskin's opinion, the close of 'the period of Turner's central power,' as ten years earlier the 'Ulysses deriding Polyphemus' had marked its beginning. During this time his imagination, working on the wealth of memoranda which he had brought together, had luxuriated in its exuberant and inexhaustible fertility; and the sum total of his merits was seen to be vast indeed in comparison with his defects, even though these might be set down without extenuation. Of the worthlessness of his drawings as accurate representations of actual scenes, enough has been said already. Turner, after emancipating himself from the topographical swathing bands of his earlier years, ceased to be exact in anything; and least of all was his method in harmony with that of the Pre-Raphaelite school, of which Mr. Ruskin would make him the founder. 'The Pre-Raphaelite landscape,' in Mr. Hamerton's words, 'is full of truthful object portraiture; hundreds of different objects are portrayed side by side as accurately as the artist could achieve it by the closest observation on the spot; in the Turnerian landscapes you cannot find a single accurate portrait of any hill, or tree, or building 'under heaven.' It is well to open our eyes at once to the fact that the duty of furnishing such portraiture formed no part of Turner's mission as it was conceived by himself; and yet he had a mission to discharge as important and lofty as any with which the painters of any age or country had ever been entrusted. His interpretation of distance left that of all other masters far behind. Nor was it in this alone that he achieved an unquestioned pre-eminence. No one ever has treated all natural forms so tenderly without losing force and breadth; no one has possessed a sense of gradation so exquisitely subtle and truthful. His paintings may not be scientifically accurate, but that they have the power of conveying the most profound impressions is proved beyond doubt by the following incidents recorded by Mr. Hamerton:—

'Some years ago several eminent French etchers came over to London for the purpose of executing plates from pictures in the National Gallery. They were all men of considerable experience in art, perfectly familiar with the old masters, and with as much modern art as may be seen in Paris; some of them were painters as well as etchers, and therefore practically acquainted with the use of oil colour. Thus prepared, and eager to make acquaintance with our national collection, they went to Trafalgar Square. It would be difficult to exaggerate

the effect which the Turner pictures produced on their minds. It was not mere critical approbation, not merely the respectful attention usually given to a great master: it was the passionate enthusiasm with which highly educated and very sensitive persons acknowledge a new, strange, irresistible influence in the fine arts. . . . All these Frenchmen, whatever had been their previous speciality in art—whether they had been etchers of the figure, or of architecture, or of landscape—asked to be employed in the interpretation of Turner; and the pictures which they most desired to etch were not those of what has been considered his sober and sane and orthodox time, but such things as those later Venices and those daring experiments in light and colour which have so often been spoken of as little better than the freaks of a gifted madman. Here then is evidence, if all other evidence were wanting, that these pictures have the one great power of all genuine works of art, as distinguished from simple imitations of nature—the power which excites and arouses the artistic susceptibilities.’

The experiments here spoken of had been carried on with more or less audacity from the time when he first broke the bonds of the traditional methods in which he had been trained. His experiments, unlike those of Rembrandt, with which we have recently dealt,* were extended beyond arrangements of light and shade to the pigments by which his effects were produced. In the choice and employment of his colours he was absolutely fearless. Whenever he thought ‘that a streak of ‘vermilion or a blot of cobalt would help the brilliance of his ‘drawing, then he set it there,’ Mr. Hamerton remarks, ‘as ‘a jeweller sets a red stone on a blue one.’ Of his experiments with materials no technical account can be given. No one ever saw him at work, nor was any one ever willingly admitted into his studio; but his pictures furnish sufficient proof that there was no new-fangled chemical which Turner would hesitate to employ, while the rapid decay of many of his most important works proves how little he cared to ascertain whether they could or could not be used with safety. He would mingle oil and water colour together in the same work, and the delicate rigging of a ship might disappear by the touch of a moist finger on the canvas. But it is clear that Turner could never have attained either his reputation or his great wealth, had not his works exhibited merits which vastly counterbalanced their defects. No one could have pointed out more dispassionately than Mr. Hamerton the failure of Turner, however it might be caused, in producing faithful portraits of actual scenes; no one could acknowledge more cordially that the drawings, so unvarnished and so untrust-

* July 1879, Art. VI.

worthy from that point of view, were full of profound truth from another. It was so with the sketch of Kilchurn which he has minutely and severely criticised. The artist's real purpose, Mr. Hamerton frankly admits, was not Kilchurn, but the play of clouds round a mountain crest.

'The mountain is any mountain you please; it resembles Ben Lomond nearly as much as Ben Cruachan. The castle is any castle you please; it resembles Ardhonnel more closely than Kilchurn, though Turner probably never saw Ardhonnel. The clouds play about the granite peak, a shower falling here from their trailing fringes, a sunbeam flashing there on the toppling silvery billows which are their ever-changing summits, a level wreath of white vapour clinging in the shelter of the peak itself, great volumes rolling and surging in the abyss of the deep corrie; and on the steep stony sides of the mountain the purple shadows fall, vast and swift, veiling each of them its hundred acres of desolation. What has all this to do with the presence or the absence of tower or turret in the dismantled ruin below? Who thinks of man's work when he witnesses the majesty of the storms on the everlasting mountains? The clouds played so for unnumbered centuries before the little feudal fortress was built, and they will play just as merrily when every vestige of it shall have utterly disappeared.'

For the realisation of this kind of truth, a truth independent of all local forms and features, and of all modifications of these forms by human handiwork, Turner deliberately and systematically sacrificed everything. It was not that he had any absorbing desire to make the desert his dwelling-place and to shut out the thought of man, his doings, and his toils, for it is abundantly clear that the chief value of landscape in his eyes lay in its human interests, and that he never loses sight of these interests when it is possible to retain them. He may furnish a series of drawings which profess to illustrate the rivers of France; but they are found to relate only to two rivers, and they are very far from illustrating their course or even the types of scenery to be met with along their banks. His drawings are chiefly of towns and buildings; but even these are not given as they would be by one who was familiar with them from the rivers out of which they seem to grow, and apart from which their peculiar charm can never be felt. They are not even drawn as they might be drawn by one who could rely on a vigorous and faithful memory. That Turner's misrepresentations of buildings are as glaring as his departures from local natural features, must be plain to any who will examine his sketches of Rouen, Paris, Blois, or Amboise. These deviations are so constant that we can scarcely ascribe them to a defect of memory; and although his wonderfully elaborate drawing of the west front of Rouen Cathedral is not altogether

accurate, and leaves an impression which few would obtain from the sight of the real structure, it yet proves that he was able to give with sufficient fidelity a mass of details which, if not put down at once upon paper, must soon have been confused or forgotten. Mr. Hamerton, we do not doubt, is right in his belief that Turner was too imaginative to have an accurate memory, and that accuracy is compatible with the imagination only when the feelings are not concerned. From the works of Turner feeling was never absent, and therefore he was always under the temptation to represent things rather as he wished them to be than as they were. We must not, however, forget that the forms which he wished or made them to assume were in strict harmony with the general truth of nature. They were the result of the patient, careful, and affectionate observation of a lifetime. They were drawn from the treasure-house of a man whose whole soul was so thoroughly in his work that it left him in all other things a barbarian. They never failed to convey to the spectator the impression of profound truth, even when he felt most irritated at the painter's lack of fidelity to local features and colouring; and they gave evidence of the unbounded range of his perceptive powers and of his complete command of the materials brought together by this means. The result was a vast addition to our knowledge of natural phenomena, and of the conditions under which they are produced; but it fell far short of a complete transcript of nature in all its aspects. Turner discovered many truths about water which the Dutch painters never apprehended, and he made the expression of the long-drawn confused reflexions on rippled surfaces peculiarly his own. But even in water effects he still left much to be discovered and expressed by others. 'Some of the common appearances of water,' Mr. Hamerton remarks, 'have not been illustrated by him in any work known to me, either in the original or in an engraving; and from some of the more complex and remarkable phenomena of water surfaces he may have abstained from prudence, knowing that it was impossible the general public should understand them.' Nor is this the only field in the regions of landscape art which Turner left unexhausted. His grouping and massing of timber and foliage are often magnificent; but he has nowhere illustrated the actual life of the forest and many aspects of rural beauty in which other painters have taken infinite delight. He has shrunk, it would seem, from dealing with colours and effects which determine the character of English landscape generally. 'Turner, as far as I am aware,' says Sir Robert Collier in his presidential address to the Devonshire Association—

'never painted a bit of positive green, such as the green of grass and meadow and some kinds of foliage, at no great distance from the eye—a beautiful colour in nature, beautiful in a picture if used with discretion, and at the present time effectively employed by the best landscape painters. Turner, with all his originality, seems never to have succeeded in completely emancipating himself from the traditions of the brown school. Nothing indicates more the indiscriminating character of Mr. Ruskin's admiration than his failing to notice this.'

On the other hand he was able to follow Nature as far as she chose to lead him. He could throw her atmosphere over every object in his drawings, and he could give, as she gives them, the masses of mountains which retain their solidity under half-tints of mist and vapour. He could reproduce the faint outlines, which in their very faintness indicate the forms over which she has thrown a veil. He could take up and let go these outlines, just as they are dropped and resumed in the endless distances of real landscapes, and thus guide all who looked upon the picture from point to point until they were impressed with the infinity not of the painter's power, but of the phenomena which he had striven to express on paper or canvas. In other words, he succeeded in reproducing in his pictures the mystery of nature. Before him no one had even dared to attempt the task; and it is not too much to say that in this wonderful achievement lies Turner's greatest strength, and that by it he has won himself a fame which future generations will not allow to die. In asserting for him this pre-eminence, Mr. Hamerton's language is as cordial and as strong as Mr. Ruskin himself could wish it to be; but his sense of truth compels him to add that it is the one and the only point in which Turner 'really did excel the artists of all time.'

Lastly, if Turner's career as a painter was marked by a course of experiments as daring as those of Rembrandt and immeasurably more varied and more fruitful, and if these experiments have already wrought much mischief in the decay of some of his finest pictures, and, it is to be feared, are destined to produce much more, it must be remembered that there is one department of Turner's work in which even to this day he is absolutely without a rival. As a painter in oils, he may be described as confused in his theories and reckless in his practice, often knowing that his pigments were not sound, and yet undeterred by the thought that pictures painted with them could never stand. The texture of his drawings in oil is generally indifferent; and if it be compared with the rich surfaces of Titian, the difference, in Mr. Hamerton's words, is 'like that between tapestry and cotton print.' But in water

colour his genius revelled with unbounded power. In some special points he may have been surpassed by more recent or still living painters; but not one has reached his great and varied excellence in the whole range of water-colour painting. His superiority, Mr. Hamerton contends, goes so far that the art itself becomes in his hands a fresh discovery of his own.

‘The colour in his most delicate work hardly seems to be laid on the paper by any means known to us, but suggests the idea of a vaporous deposit; and besides the indescribable excellence of those parts of Turner’s water colours which do not look as if they were painted at all, there is excellence of another kind in those parts which exhibit dexterities of execution. Nor is the strange perfection of his painting in water colour limited to landscape; his studies of still life—birds and their plumage, bits of interiors at Petworth, &c.—are evidence enough that, had he chosen to paint objects rather than effects, he might have been as wonderful an object painter as William Hunt was, though in a different and more elevated manner.’

But the mere delineation of objects could never be more than a pastime for Turner. His decision had long since been made, and it had been made in accordance with the inner spirit which is manifested more or less in all his works, but which seemed to be so entirely absent from his outward life. This spirit was that of the poet; and it was kindled by a power of imagination such as has been vouchsafed to few poets of any age or any country. The thoughts which he could not express in words were breathed forth in colour; and the vast store of observations which he had amassed with enormous and unwearied industry, and with a keenness of perception beyond that of almost all other men, became for him a treasure-house which furnished him with materials for an infinite series of dreams. The time spent among moors and mountains, on lakes and rivers and seacoast, added to this wealth of notes, and to his readiness in applying them; but it did not make him more locally exact or more scientifically truthful. His sketches were memoranda rather than drawings; and, as Mr. Hamerton well puts it, he received during his travels ‘a succession of landscape impressions which immediately transformed themselves in his brain till they became dreams, and these dreams either bore some resemblance to the places, or did not, just as it happened.’ Into this world of visions he could draw all who had minds to apprehend and hearts to follow him; but from it, seemingly, he could never escape himself. To quote Mr. Hamerton’s words yet again: ‘Even the hardest realities of the external world, granite and glacier, could not awaken him; but he would sit down before them

‘and sketch another dream, there in the very presence of the reality itself. Notwithstanding all the knowledge and all the observation which they prove, the interest of Turner’s twenty thousand sketches is neither topographic nor scientific, but entirely psychological. It is the soul of Turner that fascinates the student, and not the material earth.’

So the great dreamer, who had begun his course as a common-place and prosaic topographer, withdrew into his visionary world, and living in it put forth the idealised forms which the sights of the outer world awakened in his mind. If his career has any lesson at all to teach, it must be to convince us that the relation of art to nature is not that which the disciples of the Pre-Raphaelite school have taken it to be, or even that which it is supposed to be by sticklers for local exactness who stop far short of pre-Raphaelite preciseness. So far as Mr. Ruskin is concerned, the controversy seems to be settled. Although he claims for Turner the headship of this school, he yet seems to think that local fidelity may be by some means or other maintained without the preservation of any local features. Speaking of the drawing which Turner calls a sketch of San Benedetto in Venice, Mr. Ruskin tells us that its title is wrong, as the church so named is not included in the view, and then adds: ‘The buildings on the right are also, for the most part, imaginary in their details, especially in the pretty bridge which connects two of their masses; and yet, without one single accurate detail, the picture is the likeliest thing to what it is meant for—the looking out of the Giudecca landwards at sunset—of all that I have ever seen.’ If this is to be taken as a general statement that a drawing may be like a place to which it has no resemblance, the great advocate of Pre-Raphaelite exactness goes perhaps too far; and most critics would probably allow that much imaginative power may be shown in pictures which exhibit sufficient fidelity of local portraiture. The question is only as to the limits beyond which this fidelity cannot be preserved; and perhaps it is impossible to define these limits precisely. So far as the painter fails to imitate the objects before him, he does so because he holds that the exact representation would impair the beauty and the value of his drawing, and the power which enables him so to deviate from the truth of facts is the power of imagination—in other words, the artistic faculty. But for the really artistic element in a work of art there is, Mr. Hamerton asserts positively, no possible criterion. We can but say how it affects ourselves, and to do this is ‘the last and best result of art criticism.’ It would seem, then, that the theory which

would make art to be the imitation of nature is tacitly or explicitly abandoned by all except the few who may still cling to the Pre-Raphaelite hypothesis. If it be so, it follows that art and nature, although related, are two distinct things, and that an interpretation of nature is not and cannot be artistic until and unless it displays something which is not in nature, this something being the mind or imagination of the painter. It must be the result of his thought working on the general assemblage of objects before him; and only in extremely rare instances will he be able to express his thought without some modifications, however slight, of local features and local colouring. The extent to which this license may be carried is a matter which must be left to the decision of the painter, and ultimately to the public whose verdict will appreciate the value of his work. In Sir R. Collier's opinion, 'to remove an 'inconvenient tree or rock, to bring others into the picture 'which lie beyond it, to shift the foreground, which may 'be done by a slight change of position, is dealing with the 'accidents rather than with the essentials of the scene, and is 'no violation of truth to nature.' But he insists, and we think insists rightly, that much caution should be used in dealing with mountain forms, which are 'usually far finer than 'anything the artist can conceive.' This is a severe condemnation of Turner, who seems never to have cared to draw a mountain exactly after he began in 1802 to paint his dreams at Kilchurn; and it must, we think, be admitted that the condemnation is fairly called for and justified. Turner is so great that the most candid admission of his faults cannot impair the splendour of his fame. It becomes, therefore, the more imperatively his biographer's duty to pass an unprejudiced and impartial judgment on his work; and Mr. Hamerton is entitled to our gratitude for the conscientiousness with which he has performed this task. Turner will now take his true place in the great company of illustrious painters. Those who admire him most will have to admit that if he was in one sense most truthful, he was in another most untruthful in the delineation of nature. But while they allow that for all who seek in his drawings for anything like strict local fidelity the result must be bitter disappointment, they may justly claim for him the pre-eminence due to a man whose power of impressing others was inexhaustible, and who used it throughout a long life, for the purpose of teaching, cheering, and delighting them.

It will be seen from what precedes, in which we have followed the course of thought suggested by Mr. Hamerton, that

this volume deals much more fully with the works of Turner than with the man himself, and we infer from this circumstance that Mr. Hamerton had no personal acquaintance with him at all. This is much to be regretted, for if his works afford abundant matter for criticism, the character and peculiarities of Turner himself are a not less interesting study. In many respects Mr. Hamerton has not done him justice. His extreme secretiveness, his want of command of language, and the contracted circle in which he lived, rendered it difficult to know Turner well; but Mr. Hamerton has entirely failed to give us a correct likeness of him. Beneath that unpromising exterior there lay a spring of great acuteness and drollery, which now and then broke out in pungent remarks. Though fond of money and parsimonious in his habits, he could be disinterested and even generous to his friends. Nor was he by any means the solitary savage he is here represented. Chantry, Jones, and Munro of Novar were his intimate friends. At Rome, Eastlake, a much younger man than himself, worked in the same studio. He gave that rising artist excellent advice, both by word of mouth and in letters which are still in existence; and continued through life to show him the strongest marks of regard. With Landseer, Constable, Stanfield, and Leslie his relations were always friendly—indeed, no man suffered less from jealousy of his brother artists. Mr. Hamerton seems to suppose that it would have been preposterous for Turner to paint a dog. We remember to have heard Sir Edwin Landseer express the utmost admiration of the great deerhounds in the picture of the ‘Return of Adonis from the Chase’ (painted in 1807)—a work not, we think, mentioned in this volume. Turner was assiduous in his attendance at the Royal Academy, and he was no stranger at the Athenæum Club. His conversation was absolutely confined to matters connected with his own art and his own interests. That was to be expected of a man who had never lived in general society. But within the range of his own subjects it was piquant and original. The generation in which he lived has already passed away. The number of those who have any personal recollection of this great artist is small; and the time will come when people will wonder that so little is known of so remarkable a man. His biography melts away into criticism of his works, and the real person by whom they were created is barely discernible amidst the haze and splendour of his performances. That, however, has been the fate of many of the greatest poets and artists whom the world has seen.

ART. III.—1. *England and Russia in Central Asia*. By DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER. With a fac-simile of the Russian Military Map of Central Asia. Two volumes. London: 1879.

2. *Relations between the British Government and that of Afghanistan*. Parliamentary Paper. 1878.
3. *The Strategical Conditions of our Indian North-West Frontier*. By Major-General E. B. HAMLEY, C.B., R.A. London: 1878.

INDEFINITE projects of great military invasions appear to have a peculiar though somewhat transient fascination for the people of this country; and panics, like epidemics, arise from time to time, and then die away, leaving behind them, as a rule, enhanced estimates and what Mr. Disraeli once called 'bloated armaments.' But if at home we are not free from epochs of periodical depression, the disease is far more prevalent in the distant stations of our Indian Empire. It may lie latent for a time, but every now and then it breaks out with sudden and dangerous violence. As the late Lord Strangford remarked, writing years ago, about the advance of Russia in Central Asia: 'We are constantly oscillating between utter neglect and raving panic;' and since the beginning of the century our fears have led us into rather silly treaties and into deplorable frontier wars, entailing millions of reckless expenditure. In 1801 we had an acute attack of nervousness, the supposed danger then being a joint invasion of India by the Persian, French, and Afghan armies, but we were more than equal to the occasion; and in the treaty made in Teheran by Sir John Malcolm it was expressly stipulated that 'should an army of the French nation, actuated by design and deceit, attempt to settle with a view of establishing themselves on any of the islands or shores of Persia, a conjoint force shall be appointed by the two high contracting parties to destroy and put an end to the foundation of their treason.' The very grandeur of the language was in itself a triumph—the French never arrived, and the danger passed away.

The next paper invasion of India was planned at Tilsit, and its origin is thus described by Kaye:—

'Whilst the followers of Alexander and Napoleon were abandoning themselves to convivial pleasures, those monarchs were spending quiet

evenings together, discussing their future plans, and projecting joint schemes of conquest. It was then that they meditated the invasion of Hindostan by a confederate army uniting on the plains of Persia. Lucien Bonaparte, the brother of the newly styled Emperor, was destined for the Teheran mission; and no secret was made of the intention of the two great European potentates to commence, in the following spring, a hostile demonstration "contre les possessions de la Compagnie des Indes."

This new peril was, however, defeated by a second treaty at Teheran in March, 1809, in which the Shah of Persia covenanted 'not to permit any European force whatever to pass 'through Persia, either towards India or towards the ports of 'that country.' The history of this treaty is related in another part of this number, and we may perhaps now smile at the very remote dangers against which it was intended to provide; but it marks the course of bygone fears, fears that have often perplexed us since, and which are asserting themselves with renewed vigour at the present time.

Subsequently to 1809 a comparative lull supervened. It is true that we heard occasionally of the vast conceptions contained in the apocryphal will of Peter the Great, and we have never been permitted entirely to forget the dangers to our Indian Empire which are centralised in that terse sentence, 'The astute policy of the Czar;' but in 1837 the threatened invasion again came uppermost, and on this occasion a great fear arose of a combined attack by the Persians, Russians, and Afghans, of which Kaye gives the following account:—

'It was believed,' he says, 'that the danger was great and imminent. There was a Persian army, under the command of the "King of Kings" himself, investing Herat, and threatening to march upon Candahar and Cabul. There were Russian diplomatists and Russian engineers in his camp directing the counsels of the Shah and the operations of the siege. The Barukzye Sirdars of Afghanistan were intriguing with the Persian Court; and far out in the distance, beyond the mountains of the Hindoo Koosh, there was the shadow of a great northern army, tremendous in its indistinctness, sweeping across the wilds and deserts of Central Asia towards the frontier of Hindostan.'

That so-called great northern army, as we now know, but as we did not know then, was the column of Perofski, consisting of a few thousand men, which had left Orenburg with a view to chastise the Khan of Khiva, but which perished from famine and pestilence in the snowy wastes of the Barsuk desert north of the Aral.

When our troops were in Afghanistan in 1839-40, the

force under Perofski, magnified by rumour as to numbers, and its fate unknown, became a source of much anxiety to our authorities. Sir Alexander Burnes alludes to it a good deal in his correspondence at that time, and, curiously enough, concludes one of his letters from Cabul with the following remarkable observation:—‘I hold, however,’ he says, ‘that the man ‘who recommends the cantonment of a British or an Indian ‘soldier west of the Indus is an enemy to his country!’ He evidently repudiated the modern notion of a ‘scientific frontier.’ Had Sir Alexander been alive and in Cabul, what would he have said now?

But let us pass on. In the years gone by, when the kingdoms of Central Asia, their resources and power, were almost unknown, the very mystery in which they had been shrouded for centuries naturally increased our apprehensions; and it was difficult to form decided opinions as to dangers which might be lurking beyond our frontiers, especially as our own position in India was at that time not thoroughly assured. In the present day, however, we cannot at all events complain of dearth of information; we are almost surfeited by it. European travellers may not have traversed the country in all its parts, and there may be deserts whose centres are yet unexplored; but the general characteristics of the three ancient kingdoms of Bokhara, Khiva, and Kokan, and the course of recent Russian conquests are now presented to us almost in full detail, and a short consideration of them will be interesting.

Previous to 1847 the old boundary line of Russia, south of Orenburg, abutted on the great Kirghis Steppe, a zone,* as Sir Henry Rawlinson tells us, ‘of almost uninhabited desert, ‘stretching 2,000 miles from west to east, and nearly 1,000 ‘from north to south,’ and which had hitherto acted as a buffer between Russia and the Mohammedan principalities below the Aral. Captain Burnaby, in relating his famous ride not long since, gave us thrilling accounts of his frost-bitten limbs in the journey across this almost pathless waste, and of the frozen meat he had to carry in iron buckets on camels, as means of subsistence on his road to Khiva.

There is no doubt that the passage across this desolate region, and the final domination of the Kirghis, about 1847, marks an important epoch in the advance of Russia, and by bringing her into contact, as it were, with the feeble and distracted kingdoms of Kokan, Bokhara, and Khiva, has led to their partial subjugation; but Sir Henry, in his famous minute

* Parliamentary Papers, Afghanistan, 1878.

of July, 1868,* exaggerates the results of these recent conquests in several ways. He seems to be of opinion that every step taken by Russia southwards has not only been marked with prudence and caution, and has given her, as it were, a firm footing, but that, combined with her conquests in Circassia, she must of necessity obtain a secure base for future aggressive designs against India. He, however, ignores the fact that the very interposition of 1,000 miles of desert steppe between the Jaxartes and Orenburg, the nearest large post of the Russian Empire, is in itself a source of great weakness, and still remains so; and taking into consideration that great portions of the principalities themselves are equally destitute regions, devoid not only of roads, but deficient in transport, food, forage, fuel, and even of water, it is evident that the further Russia advances, the weaker and more difficult her line of communication becomes, especially as the inhabitants are Mohammedans and bitterly hostile.

Sir Henry's chief argument, however, is, that the southern advance of Russia from Orenburg is only part of one grand scheme of invasion; that it is a combined movement with that in Asia Minor; and on this latter point his assertions are still more open to question. Speaking of the conquest of the Caucasus, he says that 'it was the turning-point of Russian empire in the East. So long as the mountaineers resisted, they formed an effective barrier to the tide of onward conquest; when they were once swept away, there was no military or physical obstacle to the continuous march of Russia, from the Araxes to the Indus'! He describes all this as 'the unerring certainty of a law of nature'! Here, again, he ignores distances, and blots out with a mere stroke of his pen the mountains, deserts, and arid plains of Persia and Afghanistan, which intervene between these two rivers; and he makes no account of the warlike and hostile races who will bar the path. This is hardly sober history, and it requires a very large map to embrace all the details of this wide-spread strategy. But Sir Henry Rawlinson is not content with mere bold figures of speech; he does what is far more rash, he indulges in prophecy; and in 1868, alluding to the Russian conquests as they then stood in Central Asia, said that

'the position which, on the *soberest* calculation, Russia may be expected to occupy at the close of ten years from the present time, and supposing that during this period we abstain from all active interference against her, will be something as follows:—

'The Caspian and the Aral will be connected either by a railway or by military roads, protected by forts, and amply furnished with water and supplies. Turkestan will thus be brought into easy and direct communication not only with the Caucasus, but with the Russian cities on the Volga, and even with St. Petersburg. The independent Uzbek Governments will have ceased to exist, and in their places will have been established Russian provincial governors, the seat of central authority being probably Bokhara. The country will be administered under the joint control of Russian and native officials, according to the system which has long been successfully practised in the Trans-Caucasian provinces. Mohammedanism will be respected, though the extravagant bigotry and fanaticism of the Bokhara priesthood will, no doubt, have been retrenched. Trade will prosper; man-stealing, the present bane of the country, will be suppressed; cultivation will be increased; and the condition of the people generally will be improved. The mouths of the Oxus and Jaxartes will have been dredged and deepened, and flotillas of steamboats will have been established on both rivers.' *

This is a charming picture, and, had it been in the power of Russia to accomplish such a programme, it would indeed have been a blessing to the people and a credit to herself. Railways, roads, ample supplies of water in the desert, good government, increased trade, improved agriculture, and flotillas of steamers on the rivers, these are the projects which Sir Henry sketches out as likely to be accomplished in a decade—to be accomplished, moreover, in countries which have been devastated and misgoverned for centuries. Instead of viewing such progress with alarm, we should be lost in admiration at Russian enterprise. But, alas! we have very recent and detailed information of the present condition not only of Russian progress in Central Asia, but of the principalities generally; and if the accounts are trustworthy, it would appear that in all essential points the above prophecies are as unfulfilled now as they were in 1868, and are likely to remain so.

Amongst the many works which have lately been published on the subject, none is more complete, and apparently more to be relied on for its facts, than that of Mr. Boulger. It is not that it contains anything specially new, and its conclusions are often tinged with the prevailing Russophobia; nevertheless, to those who are interested in the question it appears to be a careful summary of the most recent history, and entirely corroborates all previous accounts. Mr. Boulger enters into copious details regarding the population, revenue, agriculture, commerce, and administration, and of the military arrange-

* Parliamentary Papers, Afghanistan, 1878.

ments of the Russian possessions in Central Asia, and in every sense they give indications of poverty, disappointment, and insecurity. He says that 'the population of this vast region' is, at the highest computation, under three millions, scattered 'over a region which exceeds Western Europe in size.' Speaking of finance, he tells us that, 'judging the Russian' rule in Central Asia exclusively by the light of its official 'budget, we find that its revenue is not only small, but that' it is also stationary, and that its outlay is large and steadily 'increasing.' The principalities he describes as being poor in agriculture, commerce, and minerals, and possessing no public works. We knew nearly all these facts before, for Mr. Schuyler* in his careful work, and others, had told us much the same story; but repeated in 1879 they are tolerably convincing of the general barrenness of the newly acquired provinces of Russia in Turkestan. When Mr. Boulger proceeds to speak of the administration and of the military arrangements, his picture is still more gloomy, and his language more outspoken. He says 'that whilst the Russians have disregarded things civil and peaceful, in order that matters 'warlike may receive every attention,' 'the military administration in Central Asia is rotten to the core.' After stating that Kaufmann's entire army is about forty thousand strong, he points out that 'it has to garrison an enormous tract of country' and keep in order the Kokandians, one of the most turbulent 'races of Central Asia. In war time those duties would become more arduous. Let Russia take never so many precautions against sedition, the advance of a large army across 'the Oxus must be the signal for local disturbances that would require to be promptly repressed.' Again: 'It would certainly be extremely hazardous to take more than half that force away from its duties; and last summer barely a third' was sent forward to Djam.†

Mr. Boulger states that 'the fighting army of Russia in Central Asia, which can be mobilised and directed by

* Schuyler's 'Turkestan,' 1876.

† Djam is a station on the extreme frontier of Russian Turkestan, a few miles to the southward of Samarcand, and in the summer of 1878, when there seemed a probability of war between this country and Russia, a force of a few thousand men was assembled there, not for the purpose, as is sometimes oddly enough assumed, of invading the Indian Empire, but from a reasonable and well-grounded apprehension on the part of General Kaufmann that we were about to undertake operations which would be likely to have a very serious effect on the position of Russia in Central Asia.

‘General Kaufmann, numbers scarcely more than 20,000 men. This,’ he says, ‘is Russia’s offensive power at the present moment.’ Therefore he naturally concludes that the army of Turkestan, even when reinforced from Orenburg, is utterly incapable of undertaking those extended operations which are necessary to carry Russian arms to the banks of the Indus.’ Mr. Boulger also informs us that there is no native army in Central Asia, Russia not venturing to raise one. As to routes, he points out that from Orenburg to Tashkend is more than 1,130 miles, across a grassless waste, and that to make a railway would be ruinously expensive.

Sir James Stephen, writing not long since on Central Asia,* compared the position of General Kaufmann, the Governor-General of Russian Turkestan, with that of Lord Wellesley in India in the early part of the century; and he anticipated that, by raising armies and forming alliances, Russia might gradually develop into a great power in Central Asia, and thus become a danger to ourselves in India. The general conditions of the country, as just described, do not, however, hold out much promise of success. Vast deserts, ruined cities, wandering Turcoman tribes, and almost universal poverty, are unpromising foundations for a great Eastern Empire. Looking at all the circumstances from a military point of view, the danger of an invasion of Hindostan from the north seems rather a visionary affair. Even were the Russian forces numerous and powerful, close to their resources, and living in a land of abundant supplies, instead of the reverse, the fact that the mountains of Afghanistan and the snowy ranges of the Hindoo-Koosh interpose between them and our dominions should of itself almost suffice to dispel our fears. A correspondent in the ‘Geographical Magazine’ of October, 1878, writes:—

‘The most important mountain range of Afghanistan is the Hindu-Kush, a name applied to the whole line of alpine watershed stretching south-west from the southern end of Pamir, and representing the Caucasus of Alexander’s historians. The spurs of this mountain chain run out on both sides into the basins of the Oxus and Kabul rivers. Its peaks, though as yet undetermined by the Indian trigonometrical surveyors, in all probability rise throughout to the region of perpetual snow, and the loftiest attain some 20,000 or 21,000 feet in height. This mighty range has formed in all times the chief barrier between the plains of Hindostan and their invaders from the north-west.’

Nature has indeed done much for us, and the very experience we have recently gained as to the difficulty and cost of moving

* Times, October 16, 1878.

a small force to Cabul, within comparative proximity to our own border, should tend to reassure us. If, powerful as we are in India, it cost us three millions sterling and the lives of 60,000 camels to establish in 1878 a 'scientific frontier' in the Afghan mountainous labyrinth a few miles in advance of our former one, we can form a fairly accurate conception of the price of the invasion of an empire.

But a new danger has arisen. The shadow of a Cossack is stated to have passed over the Great Pamir, the so-called 'Roof of the World,' and a fresh terror has been added to the many already existing. A new path for the invader, it is said, has been found. We do not as yet possess full information of the condition and capabilities of this somewhat mysterious region, portions of it being still unexplored; but, comparing the most recent accounts of Russian and English travellers, we find that the Pamir, instead of being a vast plateau as at one time supposed, consists of a mass of bare mountains, attaining elevations of 25,000 or 26,000 feet, snow-capped, and stretching in various directions, intersected by more or less wide valleys and gorges as denuded of vegetation as the mountains themselves. As a rule it is extremely sterile, and has a rigorous climate, small patches of grass only being found on the banks of the streams. To those who have travelled in the high and solitary regions of the Himalayas, the above account will tell its own story. In these great altitudes, life can scarcely be supported, food for man and beast is always scarce, the summer very short, and the population necessarily extremely scanty; and although the Russians might, if unopposed, trickle as it were in feeble dribblets over the Pamir, it would only be to lose themselves in the gorges of the Himalayas about Gilgit and Chitral, where the most ordinary precautions on our part would suffice to stop their progress.*

The general position of Russia in Central Asia is that of a great power which has lately conquered a vast space of territory composed chiefly of arid wastes and almost uninhabited steppes, interspersed with occasional tracts of fertility, and dotted here and there with Eastern cities and centres of population. It has been shown that supplies are scanty, the roads mere camel tracks, the revenue small, and the people hostile.

* The lowest pass over the Hindoo-Koosh into the Chitral valley is 12,000 feet above the sea, and is closed by snow for more than half the year. The other passes are very difficult, being between 16,000 and 17,000 feet above the sea, and some of them are covered with perpetual snow.

Civil government is barely established ; financially the country does not pay ; and although there is no power in that part of Central Asia which can withstand Russia in the field, her troops are far from the main resources of the Empire, and are necessarily frittered away in isolated detachments over a vast area, and are incapable of concentration. It is possible that in time Russia may to some extent consolidate her conquests and ameliorate her position, but the normal conditions of the country are against her. It does not therefore appear that we need be apprehensive as to her power to injure us, nor are we justified in entertaining constant suspicions as to her motives in conquering the wretched marauding tribes whose government is so detestable, and who for so long a period have infested these regions. Russia may not have the wish to injure us, but, in a military point of view, she does not appear to possess the power or to be likely to attain it in Central Asia, which is a far more important consideration.

It is time, however, to turn to other scenes, and to military movements somewhat similar in their nature, which it is supposed are likely to be enacted on another part of the stage. If that great northern army, which Kaye described ‘as tremendous in its indistinctness’ forty years ago, has lost some of its terrors, now that its weakness has become apparent, another army coming from the west has taken its place, the seat of whose power is supposed to lie in the far Caucasus, whilst its outposts already extend along the hot sands on the eastern shores of the Caspian. The people of England, who as a rule have neither time nor inclination to study closely the progress of a crafty strategy which takes many decades to mature, and requires whole continents for its development, are in some respects much to be pitied. Anxious for peace, they find themselves constantly perplexed by vague rumours of danger to India, from north and west, gravely put before them by statesmen, soldiers, and others, by men who are presumed to speak with experience and authority ; and it will be interesting to quote a few of the more recent instances. The Marquis of Salisbury, writing as Secretary of State for India in February 1876, in a despatch the policy of which has already produced such dire results, says :—

‘The maintenance in Afghanistan of a strong and friendly power has at all times been the object of British policy. The attainment of this object is now to be considered with due reference to the situation created by the recent and rapid advance of the Russian arms in Central Asia towards the northern frontiers of British India. Her Majesty’s Government cannot view with complete indifference the pro-

bable influence of that situation upon the uncertain character of an Oriental chief whose ill-defined dominions are thus brought, within a steadily narrowing circle, between the conflicting pressures of two great military empires, one of which expostulates and remains passive, whilst the other apologises and continues to move forward.'

Sir Henry Rawlinson's views have already been quoted. According to his judgment, some unerring law of nature has exerted its influence, so that no military or physical obstacles now exist to the advance of Russia from the Araxes to the Indus!

Sir Bartle Frere, writing in 1874, conjectured that Russian vagabonds might drill the Afghans and cast their cannon, and that Russia might impel hordes of Asiatic barbarians upon India, such as followed Nadir Shah almost within living memory. Sir James Stephen holds somewhat similar views, and considers that Russia may gradually obtain ascendancy over the whole of Central Asia, 'including Persia and Afghanistan,' and thus be enabled to form great armies and invade India. General Sir Henry Green sketches out rather a different and a very strange combination. Writing in January 1878 about Indian dangers,* he points out the probability

'of the formation of a powerful and well-trained *Turco-Russian* army of the Caucasus, eager for war, and having the resources of the Russian and Turkish Empires at its back, and transferred to Tiflis *viâ* Batoum in addition to other routes now existing. Under such circumstances,' he says, 'and with the fate of Turkey before her eyes, does anyone believe that Persia would offer much resistance to a Russian advance? . . . With the resources of Persia at her command—and these resources, in the shape of baggage animals, &c., would be very great—what are the difficulties likely to prevent a Russian army from advancing *viâ* Teheran as well as by the valley of the *Attrek* to Herat, and from thence on by Candahar, or towards any point on our Indian frontier that circumstances might suggest? What (he says) are the mountain ranges and deserts to be found on a large or a little map intervening on that route?'

This is indeed a strange jumble.

Mr. Boulger follows in a similar path, and writes that

'Russia's military strength in Central Asia is limited and in an undeveloped stage. But there can be no doubt that it exists, and that for the accomplishment of any ordinary enterprise it would suffice. In the direction of the Caspian, where the army of the Caucasus—behind which stands the European army—can be called into play, it is formidable; and if ever India is to be wrested from England by external force, it will be from this direction that the attack will be made.'

* Pall Mall Gazette, January 30, 1878.

Colonel Baker,* who in 1875 stood on the crest of the mountains of Khorassan, looking towards the north over the sandy wastes which lead to Merv, was very unhappy at the apathy of his countrymen, and told us that 'the dangers threatening India are looming nearer and nearer, and nothing as yet has been done to meet or arrest them,' and that 'we are content to leave the safety of the greatest empire the world has ever seen to the hazards of chance or the mercies of our enemies.'

All this is somewhat dreary reading, and, were it necessary to give a detailed and serious reply, ample materials are at hand in the recorded opinions of such men as the late Lords Lawrence and Sandhurst and of Sir Henry Lawrence; of the Earl of Northbrook, Sir Henry Norman, Sir Vincent Eyre, and others of equal weight and authority. The recent debates in Parliament and the correspondence in newspapers on the Afghan war, however, prove that the public generally are not likely to commit the folly of allowing visions of remote and almost impalpable dangers to run away with their judgment in measuring the power of Russia in that part of the world.

The experience of the war of 1877 between Russia and Turkey, in the Armenian highlands, would appear to prove that the army of the Caucasus has duties and responsibilities of its own sufficiently onerous to prevent its seeking fresh adventures in a far-distant country. The 150,000 men of whom it is said to be composed did not find it an easy task, after years of preparation, to penetrate a few miles into Asia Minor, when only opposed by a comparatively feeble quota of the least efficient portion of the Turkish army; indeed, in the earlier months of the campaign, the Russian forces found themselves defeated and thrown back over their own border. Tiflis, the headquarters of the army of the Caucasus, is, in round numbers, 2,250 miles from the Indus (about the same distance apparently that it is from the Thames), and what we are to try and believe is that, absolved in some way from its ordinary functions, this army is to undertake a march through Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan, and, defying all natural obstacles and the possible antagonism of martial races and fanatical Moham-medans, it is, with unexhausted power, to deploy on the plains of Hindostan, and to reap its reward in the conquest of an empire. This is a fancy sketch indeed.

Sir Henry Rawlinson is the great authority in these matters, and he tells us† that in the spring of 1878 discussions took

* *Clouds in the East*, 1876.

† 'The Afghan Crisis,' *Nineteenth Century*, December 1878. By Major-General Sir Henry Rawlinson, K.C.B.

place at St. Petersburg, their object being the overthrow of the English rule in India; and that the project most in favour was that of General Miliutin, the Minister of War, who suggested the transfer bodily of the army of the Caucasus, under General Loris Melikoff, across the Caspian, from thence to advance on India. The limited amount of the local resources in the many districts through which the Russians would have to pass in their wonderful march of 2,250 miles; the varying nature of the countries, composed in great measure of mountains, rocky steppes, and arid plains, with occasional tracts of cultivation; the want of good roads, the comparative deficiency of transport, and the extremes of climate—all these taken together would seem to be fatal obstacles to the accomplishment of General Miliutin's purpose.* The Caucasus army might start strong in numbers and in heart; but the necessity of maintaining its communications, the dwindling away of its ranks by sickness and death, would leave but a sorry number with which to emerge on the plains of India. Then, again, the necessity of being accompanied by siege trains and vast supplies of munitions cannot be left out of account. Modern armies on the march do not gather strength and bulk like a snowball; nor is there any instance in modern days in which a general has accomplished a feat at all approaching to that so lightly proposed for the army of the Caucasus.

Sir Henry Rawlinson admits that the co-operation of the Afghans and Persians would be necessary to the success of the scheme; but, looking at the feeble authority of their rulers, to the frequent revolutions, and to the treacherous character of these fanatical races, the contingency of their hostility would have to be provided against by adequate precautions along the line of march. An expedition of the kind must necessarily extend over a long period of time, so that we should have ample leisure to concentrate such force as we might deem sufficient to meet the enfeebled legions of Russia as they emerged from the passes after their long and dangerous

* Colonel Baker in his 'Clouds in the East,' speaking of Persia, tells us 'that it has a grossly corrupt system of government, a bankrupt treasury, no fleet, and an army which for any practical purpose is useless. The whole eastern centre of Persia,' he says, 'is a vast salt plain, uncultivated and uninhabited, and which, from its want of water, can only be passed by small caravans of camels on a few roads, where brackish wells exist, and even then with great difficulty.'

Mr. Arthur Arnold, in his book 'Through Persia by Caravan,' and Mr. McGregor's 'Khorassan,' convey the same general impression of barrenness, poverty, misgovernment, and decay.

march. Possibly, also, before they had got halfway they might hear that the people of the Caucasus behind them were in an uproar, and their return urgently demanded. No army can perform two duties far distant from each other at the same time, without danger of collapse at one end or the other.

Even Sir Henry Rawlinson hardly seems to have faith in his own forebodings; for in December 1878 * he tells us that 'it is probable, however, that the great expedition was found on examination to be altogether beyond Russian resources. The expense of moving the army of the Caucasus and replacing it with local levies would have been enormous. The means of transport on the Caspian, even if all the Volga steamers had been called in, would have been quite insufficient to move 70,000 men. The co-operation of Persia could not be relied on, and without it neither carriage nor provisions could be obtained for the march through Khorassan. Altogether it may be questioned if the grand scheme was ever developed beyond its embryo.'

On the whole it is difficult to regard such propositions as other than idle dreams. As a foundation for them, it seems to be assumed that Russian armies can march for thousands of miles, over mountains, across deserts, through foreign countries, ignoring every difficulty, and defying all strategical considerations; whilst the British army, it is equally assumed, is commanded by imbeciles, and is incapable of striking a blow or marching a yard. Barren steppes and scanty population may be said to be prevailing characteristics in Russian Turkistan, and indeed meet us in every corner of Central Asia. Allusion has already been made to that great Kirghis waste, 2,000 miles long and 1,000 broad, between Orenburg and the Aral, which served so long to check the onward march of Russia southwards, and which still intervenes as a barrier between the Empire and her distant outposts—so much so that General Romanoffski declared, 'it took nearly two years to move troops and stores from the Volga across the Kirghis steppes to the advanced posts beyond the Bokhara frontier.' The Russians probably hoped that, once across this region, they would be brought into contact with less savage races, and gain possession of more fertile lands; and to some slight extent it may be so. But Mr. Schuyler, writing in 1876, tells us that

'Central Asia was thought to be a rich country, and was regarded almost as a promised land. It was believed that not only would it support the troops stationed there, but that it would also afford large

* 'The Afghan Crisis,' Nineteenth Century, December 1878.

and increasing revenues to the Government. What I have said in a previous chapter about the commerce, agriculture, and mineral resources of the country will show how far this was in reality from being the case. . . . The primary objects which led to the occupation of Central Asia were military rather than financial; and as long as the province is considered valuable from a military and political point of view, the financial burden must be borne. It seems, however, difficult to expect great ultimate profit from the country from any point of view.¹

Far, however, as the Russians have advanced, they only find themselves more deeply involved in scenes of desolation. In the very heart of their present possessions, and occupying a very large portion of it, lies the great Black Desert, of which some idea will be gained from the following description:—

‘Far and wide, although no longer so far or so wide as formerly, over the waste expanse of Kara-Kum there roam tribes who are independent of all earthly authority, whose hand is against every man, and who are known as Turkmen or Turcomans. The great desert of Kara-Kum, extending from the Caspian to the Oxus, and from Khiva to Persia, has been their home for centuries; and they are still to be found there in the same wild state of independence as their fathers were seven centuries ago. Their irregular confederacy has stood the test of time far better than some more regular modes of government, and, so far as matters have yet progressed, they appear to be better able to defend their rights than the other states and nationalities of Central Asia. The practical importance of the Turcomans in the present phase of the Central Asian question cannot be over-estimated. They are evidently the next opponent with which Russia will come into contact, and to some degree the contest may be said to have already begun.’ *

With a view of obtaining some slight authority over the Turcomans, and in the hope of promoting trade, the Russians within the last ten years have established a few stations on the eastern shores of the Caspian Sea, the more important of which are Krasnavodsk, opposite Baku, and Chikisliar, a few miles north of the Attrek, the northern boundary of Persia. These isolated posts, being on the very verge of the desert, and having no resources of their own, even water being scarce, have to depend for supplies of every kind either on Baku or other Russian stations on the Caspian, and, being moreover unable to communicate with General Kaufmann at Tashkend, have, since 1874, been placed under the control of the authorities at Tiflis. These are the outposts from which several expeditions have recently been despatched against the Turcomans, but as yet with very doubtful success.

* Boulger's ‘England and Russia in Central Asia.’

Colonel Veniukoff,* alluding to Krasnavodsk, says:—

‘With regard to trade in the Trans-Caspian districts, the development of which was the official motive for founding Krasnavodsk, we have nothing further to say, as it does not exist, and never will, as the Turcomans buy nothing; while for the trade with Khiva, Bokhara, and the sources of the Oxus, there are many other routes more convenient than the uninhabited and waterless wastes of sandhills which extend for distances of 400, 600, and 1,000 miles from Krasnavodsk.’

This is not a cheerful account, and it is quite corroborated by the letters of the correspondent of the ‘Daily News’ who, during last summer, accompanied the Russian columns which have lately endeavoured to penetrate the country of the Turcomans from Krasnavodsk and Chikisliar by the Kizil-Arvat route, and which suffered so considerable a defeat in September last at Denghil-Tepe, on the road to Merv.

So little is known at first hand from English sources of these new Russian positions on the eastern shores of the Caspian, that a few extracts from the letters of the ‘Daily News’ correspondent will be of interest:—

‘Krasnavodsk is situated in a sandy desert surrounded by scorched hills of reddish-brown sandstone. Not a blade of grass, not a shrub, breaks the dreary waste. Ten years ago not even a Turcoman could inhabit the spot, and now it is only due to the energy of General Lomachine that anybody else can. So thoroughly artificial an existence as that of Krasnavodsk it would be difficult to imagine. There are absolutely no local resources, if I except a limited supply of undrinkable water, which during the hotter months entirely disappears. Even now in the month of April the heat is so great, about 80 degrees, that everything is burned up, and people go to sleep at midday, anything like exertion being out of the question. Firewood is brought at a great cost from Lincoran, on the opposite Persian shore. Flour and other necessaries come from Baku. In order that the population may have water, the Government has established a distillery, which, working night and day, manages to provide a scanty supply of the necessary fluid at a very considerable cost. This example alone speaks eloquently of the savage desolation prevailing.’

Again:—

‘Krasnavodsk, having no *raison d'être* of its own, was founded specially as a maritime emporium of trade with Khiva and Central Asia generally, in connexion with the proposed railway from Baku to Tiflis and that already existing from the latter town to Poti, whence Persian and other merchandise is conveyed by steamer to Odessa and other Black Sea ports. Khivan and other merchants have already

* ‘Progress of Russia in Central Asia,’ by Colonel M. S. Veniukoff, 1877.

crossed the Kara Koom (Black Desert) with their caravans to Krasnavodsk; but so often have they fallen a prey to forays of the independent Turcoman hordes of the intermediate districts, that commerce by this route has long since entirely ceased, and goods coming to Russia from Khokand, Tashkend, and districts bordering on China, are sent by the longer but more secure route of Fort Alexandrow and the Sea of Aral. The Turcomans who interrupt trade and carry on a systematic brigandage on every side, seizing indifferently Russian and Persian subjects, as well as their neighbours to the eastward, and retaining them as slaves or holding them till ransomed, inhabit the district known as the Tekke. . . . These Tekke Turcomans are a most untameable predatory race, and have existed from time immemorial in the same state of independence and aggressiveness. Their country is a savage wilderness, in which they shift to and fro according as the pasture, such as it is, fails, or the wells become dried up.'

Of Chikisliar, the same correspondent, writing in April last, said :—

'Chikisliar* is of still more recent origin than Krasnavodsk, and even still more purely a military settlement. It is, in fact, simply an entrenched camp of some five or six battalions, the civil element consisting of a few Russian traders and a scattering of Turcoman fishermen. Like all these eastern Caspian settlements of late construction, Chikisliar has absolutely no local resources save the sea and river fisheries. All around is a hopeless desert. The sand dunes of the Bretagne coast would look smiling and verdant beside the ghastly desolation of this hideous locality. Actual contact with the place and personal experience are necessary to form an adequate idea of what is meant by the Kara Koom—the Black Desert.'

Speaking of the recent Russian expedition, he says that one of their most advanced military stations is at Chat, a post in the desert about 140 miles north-east of Chikisliar, and situated at the junction of the Attrek and Sambre, two small streams about fifteen or twenty feet wide, their waters being almost unfit for drinking purposes owing to sediment. 'It has 'rarely been my lot,' he says, 'to see anything so utterly desolate as the surroundings of Chat.'† The usual route from Chikisliar to Chat leads along the northern bank of the Attrek, both sides being desert, very unhealthy, and infested with Turcomans, and it appears that from November to February

* The Caspian is so shallow at Chikisliar that ships of small burden have to anchor three miles from the shore.

† A Russian writer says that Chat is the most repulsive place along the whole Attrek, and the Sambre a dirty stream. Speaking of the heat, dust, flies, &c., in August, he adds, 'Life, however, is still 'possible even at Chat.'

in each year this wretched road is absolutely closed by inundations and the consequent softening of the ground.

As it has often been stated that the River Attrek is navigable, and will therefore be of great service to the Russians in their march into the desert, it will be well to give a further extract from the letter of the correspondent of the 'Daily News' dated October last.

'What I have seen of the Attrek at different seasons leads me to believe that, even as far as Chat, it is entirely useless as a means of water transit. At present it is shrunk to a miserable muddy ditch, at places not over 8 feet wide, and almost everywhere fordable to horses. That it occasionally assumes more respectable dimensions is evident from the various water-level marks on its banks. It must occasionally have a depth of over 20 feet, and an average width of 30, without overflowing its regular channel, which is cut as regularly as that of any canal, winding in the centre of a vast ravine with vertical sides. Sometimes this ravine has a breadth of three-quarters of a mile. On neither the north nor south shores is the Attrek available for irrigation purposes, the great depth to which it has cut its bed precluding such a possibility. Hence the entire barrenness of the desert on either side, reaching from the commencement of its delta to over a hundred miles above Chat. The extreme percentage of sediment makes its water unfit for human consumption without filtering or deposition; and for the supply of camels and horses it has to be fetched with great labour, by zigzag steep paths cut in the huge earth cliffs of the ravine, from the central channel to the plains above.'

The correspondent, not having been permitted to proceed with the advanced portion of the expedition, is unable to give us his personal experience of its fate; but from the official accounts and other sources it appears that the Russian forces, about 8,000 strong, advanced along the foot of the northern slopes of the Khorassan mountains, through the narrow Tekke oasis towards Merv, and were defeated by the Turcomans, with great loss, at Denghil Tepe, about 150 miles north-east of Chat—the most recent accounts stating that the greater part of their troops have fallen back on Chikisliar, the road being strewn with the dead bodies of horses and camels—and that the campaign for the time is at an end. This is the Russian base on the Caspian to which Lord Salisbury alluded, as affecting our frontier position in India, in his speech at Manchester on October 17 last.

The country in which the Russians have recently suffered so considerable a defeat is very little known, and, as it is likely to be the scene of further conflicts, the following description of it by Sir Henry Rawlinson will be of interest:—

‘The country* of the Tekke Turcomans commences at Kizgil Arvat, and continues in a more or less connected line the whole way to Merv, the distance by the nearest line being about 400 miles; but it is hardly possible that any disciplined army could follow this direct route. The only convenient line for the march of a Russian force would be along the foot of the hills the whole way round to Serakhs, and then across the desert at its narrowest point by the high road from Persia to Bokhara, a detour which would increase the distance from 400 to 450 miles.’

As regards the narrow strip of country at the foot of the mountains of Khorassan, in which are the chief settlements of the Tekkes, Sir Henry tells us that—

‘to the north it is protected by an almost waterless desert, the shortest line across which is twelve days’ march for a caravan, and is practicable only for small numbers. South of it extends a mass of lofty mountains with few passes practicable even for mule carriage. West, 130 miles of barren desert intervene between it and the (Caspian) sea.’

Again he writes:—

‘The distance from the Caspian to Merv by the Akhal country and Serakhs is about 700 miles, and to keep up communications by a line of posts along this interval would be a very serious operation indeed. From the western end of the Deregez Attock, moreover, to Serakhs, a distance of 200 miles, the line would pass through Persian or quasi-Persian territory, and Russia, therefore, could not of course undertake such a movement without an understanding with the government of the Shah. In the matter of supplies, also, food could not be possibly obtained in the districts traversed by the Russian columns. Either provision caravans must follow the troops from the Caspian, which along a line of 700 miles would entail enormous expense and risk, or grain must be supplied from Khorassan.’

A consideration of the above descriptions of Krasnavodsk and Chikisliar, of the deserts surrounding them, together with the results of the recent Russian expedition against the Turcomans, will enable us to form some idea of the difficulties that Russia must meet and overcome, should she attempt to gain possession of Merv; and, her arrival there having been so often foretold, and being considered by many as involving so much danger to our dominions in the East, a few moments may be devoted to a place which may almost be termed the Capital of the Alarmists.

There is, so far as is known, only one Englishman alive who has visited Merv—General James Abbott, of the Artillery.

* ‘The Road to Merv,’ by Major-General Sir H. Rawlinson, K.C.B. Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, March 1879.

This distinguished old officer travelled from Herat to Khiva about forty years ago, and in the interesting account of his journey, after describing the valley of the Murghab and its comparative, though much neglected fertility, he speaks of Merv as a wretched plain, the town itself consisting of about a hundred mud huts, and the country around a wilderness. The late Lord Strangford, speaking of it, said that 'it must always have been surrounded by deserts, however much greater must have been the proportion of fertile land in ancient times irrigated by means of the Murghab.' *

The real fact is that Merv, so far as we know of it, is a small Turcoman town on the edge of a vast wilderness. Standing on the Murghab, and being at the junction, as it were, of the attenuated lines of communication which lead from Khiva, Bokhara, and the shores of the Caspian, it is so far important that such commerce as still exists in these desolate regions finds its way, on camels' backs, between Merv and Herat. The Murghab, ere it becomes absorbed in the thirsty sands to the north, gives a certain limited amount of fertility to the district, and therefore, as an oasis amidst such a great area of barrenness, it is comparatively well peopled at certain periods of the year. But, as a strategical base of operations, or even as a halting-place for an army of invasion against India, it is in almost every respect as over-estimated as it is unfitted. The very expedition of which mention has just been made will suffice to prove the great difficulty of approach, and, even should these difficulties ultimately be overcome, it does not follow that possession of Merv will give it strategical importance, or render it available as a station for further advance.

A general officer at Merv, ordered to move southwards on Herat, and so on to Candahar and the Indus, might well feel in a condition of almost hopeless despair. In the first place it would be absolutely incumbent on him to collect a very considerable force, duly provided with heavy artillery and munitions of all kinds, the mere concentration of which over such

* Captain Marsh, who was at Herat in 1872, made enquiries about Merv, and says that, 'since it was destroyed by Nadir Shah, and after that by the Ameer of Bokhara in 1787, it had never been rebuilt, and to this day, though called the chief town of the Turkomans, does not contain a single house. At certain seasons of the year, after harvest, the tribes assemble here with the produce of farm or flock, and pitch their black goat's-hair or felt tents amidst the ruins of the ancient Shah Jehan. . . . In the great heats the town is again deserted, the river Murghab being then nearly, and often quite, dry.' ('A Ride through Islam,' 1877.)

routes as have been described would occupy a long time and entail enormous cost. Looking back, he would be aware of the vast distances between himself and the nearest resources of the empire—distances not merely to be measured by the actual number of miles, although they are very great, but aggravated by the accumulated obstacles of unhealthy foodless deserts and unsafe communications. Neither from the north nor from the west could he hope at any time to receive reinforcements, except by small detachments and at rare intervals, so that his very position, without moving at all, would be precarious and depressing. But it may be said that a general, whilst not neglecting his communications, should refrain from dwelling too much on dangers left behind, and should rather keep his eyes and his thoughts constantly directed to the front. The outlook from Merv, however, and the prospects of a successful advance, are perhaps even less promising than a retreat across the desert. From Merv to the Indus is, in round numbers, about 1,000 miles; and although, in the vicinity of Herat and Candahar, a certain limited amount of supplies could be found, we know, from the accounts of Ferrier, Marsh, and others, that the only route lies through districts where rocky mountains and sandy wastes vie with each other for the mastery, and that the country, as a matter of course, is infested with marauding tribes. Our own experience is amply sufficient to enable us to realise the difficulties and dangers of a march of 1,000 miles through Afghanistan.

The city of Herat, standing in a comparatively fertile valley at the western extremity of Afghanistan, holds a position of undoubted importance, both in a strategical and commercial point of view. What its fate may be under the present unhappy circumstances of Afghanistan, and now that the chief authority at Cabul has been subverted, it is somewhat hard to say; but, as it is well understood that England would not permit it to fall into the hands of Russia, it is satisfactory to know that there is no reasonable expectation of her being able to get there, so that our minds need not be harassed by imaginary contingencies. It may be quite true, as Mr. Boulger tells us, that 'there are roads from Herat that, if followed up to their termination, will take one not only to Moscow or Calcutta, but to Peking and the shores of the China Sea.' He might have added to the North Pole and the Equator. The same might be said of a great many other places, but the fact is not in itself in any way alarming.

Whilst Russia has been engaged for many years past in the painful and almost fruitless effort of establishing her power

amidst the remains of ancient but decayed principalities, and of endeavouring to introduce civilisation and order into regions where almost every element of prosperity is deficient, it is time now to allude to the great empire which England has established in the East; and here we are at once met by conditions in many respects of an entirely opposite character to those with which we have hitherto been called upon to deal. Dr. W. Hunter, the Director-General of Indian Statistics, not long since gave two very interesting lectures at Edinburgh, his theme being 'What England has done for India;' and although in an article like the present, devoted chiefly to military considerations, it would not be convenient to describe minutely the improvements effected in the civil administration of our dominions in the East, still the armed strength of a great power depends so much upon the contentment of the people, and upon the due development of the resources of the country, that it will be useful to allude shortly to the very encouraging account given by Dr. Hunter of our progress in India. He tells us that 'the test of British rule in India was not what it had done for ourselves, but what it had done for the Indian people,' and he goes on to point out 'that British rule in India meant order in place of anarchy, protection in place of oppression, government by the law in place of government by the sword, and a vast free people dwelling in safety where of old each man was beaten down beneath whosoever was stronger than himself.' Dr. Hunter relates how, in former days, the country had been subject to successive hordes of invaders, even down to the middle of the last century; to hosts of men who overran the country, paying for nothing, eating up its resources, and devastating whole provinces by fire and sword; that, as a consequence, the border lands lay silent and waste, and were almost swept bare of inhabitants. Not only that, but the people suffered almost equally from their own rulers. 'The dying throes,' he says, 'of the Mogul Empire had let loose its disbanded and revolted armies upon the people, and the troops lived by open pillage.' These dire agencies having been destroyed by the vigour of our rule, and security having been obtained, the peasants at once spread over the fertile but hitherto depopulated provinces. Improved agriculture has of late years vastly increased the value of the land; trade has been developed, and great commercial cities have arisen, so that in 1878, India was able to export 63,000,000*l.* sterling of produce. In addition to these great benefits an efficient police and just tribunals have been established, crime has consequently diminished, and education and municipal institutions

developed. After enumerating all these encouraging signs of prosperity and progress, Dr. Hunter concluded his lectures by truly saying that 'our history in India has been chequered by 'occasional mistakes, but, on the whole, it forms 'a splendid 'narrative of empire fairly won and honestly governed in the 'interests of the people.'

It is, however, in its military rather than in its purely civil aspect that it will be interesting now to regard our government of India, and here again we have ample evidences of efficiency and of concentrated power. We are able to raise large and highly efficient armies, recruited from the many martial races of the country, which so loyally support and supplement our English battalions. The improved means of communication by railways, roads, and rivers enable us to move our troops and necessary appliances with ease and rapidity from one end of the country to the other. The postal and telegraphic facilities are also important in their way. The arsenals are established at strategical centres, and our armaments and munitions can be augmented at will, either from England or by local manufacture.

It may perhaps be considered unnecessary to dwell upon facts and features so well known, and a consideration of which proves the enormous military strength we possess in Hindostan. Judging, however, by the alarmist tone so often adopted in comparing the position of Russia and England in the East, it would seem that the great increase of our power, especially of late years, is not sufficiently borne in mind. The strong position we hold in India is due not only to the fact that we have made great progress in giving security to life and property, in developing the fertility and general resources of the country, and in improving its communications, but that, whilst we have been thus beneficially engaged, the countries all round us have, in all these essential points, either stood still or to some extent perhaps even retrograded. This is a most important consideration. India may not in every respect be well governed, and may not have fully recovered from centuries of previous misrule and invasion, but as a whole it is enjoying peace and prosperity, whilst all the countries beyond it to the north-west remain in their normal state of decay. Afghanistan, Persia, the Principalities of Central Asia, and even Turkey in Asia—all these countries present pictures of desolation. In them life and property are insecure, agriculture is neglected, commerce is drooping, the revenues are small, and, partly owing to the destruction of the forests, the very climate has changed, and from want of water whole regions have become

rocky plateaux or sandy deserts. The roads are mere camel tracks, railways are unknown, and means of transport very deficient. The various Mohammedan races may retain their ancient courage, but the armies of these countries are miserably equipped with obsolete weapons, and arsenals, in the modern conception of the term, are unknown. The very condition of these impoverished lands offers perhaps the best security against the advance of a great power like Russia.

In discussing, however, the possibilities of an invasion of India, it is often assumed that, because in past times successful incursions have constantly been made from the north-west, there is nothing to prevent Russia from repeating the process in our own time. It is supposed that because Alexander the Great, Genghis Khan, Nadir Shah, and many others, were able in former days to penetrate with hordes of barbarians into India, therefore Russia may now achieve a similar result by somewhat similar means. But the conditions are essentially altered; and it will be interesting to consider the strategical aspect of such a question, the broad features of which are so well brought out by Colonel Hamley in his 'Operations of War.'

Speaking of campaigns in ancient days, he tells us that the military arrangements demanded no great amount of previous preparations; that the invading forces consisted chiefly of armed retainers of feudal chiefs, hastily collected, and who, carrying but few supplies, and unencumbered with trains of artillery, munitions, food and stores, descended on the enemy's territory like a flight of locusts, pillaging and devastating as they went, until the scene of their operations gradually became frightful deserts. Magazines, wheeled transport, and lines of communication were hardly thought of in those days, and operations could be successfully carried out in this reckless fashion because the enemy to be attacked was equally deficient in organisation and in the knowledge and appliances of modern warfare.

'In earlier times,' he says, 'the population was sparse, the infertile tracts of land frequent, the roads few and bad, while the artillery and trains would have been cumbrous, even had the ways been good. Thus many conditions were still wanting to the development of the science of strategy.'

But Colonel Hamley goes on to show that modern armies require very different conditions and preparations.

'As the power of an army on a distant enterprise,' he says, 'depends on its united and concerted action, it is necessary to its full efficiency that it should be able to assemble at any time. It must therefore be

accompanied by everything requisite for its maintenance. Food, ammunition, clothing, medicine, and recruits must find free access to it; and the stream of these supplies must be unceasing. The first preparation for war is the establishment of great depôts and magazines, and these were collected in places that were secured from the enemy's attacks either by natural defences or artificial fortifications.' . . .

'In mountainous districts, where the roads are so rugged and steep as to be unfit for wheeled vehicles, the necessary supplies must be carried on pack-horses or mules. But the quantity which an animal can draw is so much greater than that which it can carry, that the number of animals and the extent of road they occupy must be immensely increased. It is therefore very difficult, almost impossible, to supply a very large army under such circumstances for a long campaign; and roads practicable for carriages are indispensable to all operations, except those which aim at attaining their results in a brief and definite time. And not only must the roads be good in the ordinary sense, but they must be great main arteries of the region, solidly constructed.'

To the student of the art of war the above quotations will contain nothing new; but their application to a supposed invasion of India by a Russian army from the north-west will show at once that, whilst we derive all the advantages in India of modern armed strength, Russia has to contend with the augmented difficulties of having to transport her forces through countries in a condition which fatally bars advance. In short, we now possess in India an efficient, highly disciplined, well-equipped army, which can be increased at will, with powerful artillery, and ample supplies at hand; arsenals well stocked, and every appliance of war in its most recent development. Russia, on the other hand, if she is ever to invade us with any chance of success, must necessarily move her troops encumbered with all the impedimenta of modern warfare; she must establish magazines and depôts as she goes, and all this far away from the resources of her own territories. Her soldiers will have to march across deserts and over mountains containing but scanty supplies of either food, fuel, transport, or even water. In fact, she has to accomplish the almost impossible task of moving a modern army over countries which have been devastated and ruined for centuries past. Were the theatre of war in Europe, where roads are numerous and supplies plentiful, a march of invasion extending over 1,000 miles of country would be a sufficiently daring undertaking, but under the conditions above noted it is simply impossible. Thus we see that the impoverished condition of all the countries beyond our frontiers to the north-west in reality is a great safeguard, and presents an almost impassable barrier against

Russian aggression. We have, in short, been able during a century of possession to consolidate a powerful military empire in India, whilst our external surroundings remain, for all practical purposes, in the hopeless condition created by centuries of devastation and neglect. If these strategical conditions are soundly conceived, the idea that Russia can imitate the deeds of the former conquerors of India becomes an illusion, the conditions being hopelessly against her.

The object of the foregoing remarks has been to discuss, in a general and comprehensive manner, the comparative power of England and Russia in what is termed Central Asia; and it would, therefore, hardly fall within the limits of the present paper to dwell at any length on the policy recently pursued in the attainment of a so-called scientific frontier in the north-west of India. Indeed, if the conclusion is sound that we are strong in India, whereas Russia is weak and distant, the frontier question becomes one of comparatively minor importance. But although the position of Russia in Central Asia carries with it no sense of real or proximate danger to our empire in the East, still the presence of a great power beyond Afghanistan, occupying a position hitherto held by weak and disordered principalities, no doubt so far affects the question, that we naturally and properly have for many years past carefully considered its probable effect on the ruler and people of the intervening country of Afghanistan. That poor and mountainous region, thinly inhabited by a brave but fanatical people, undoubtedly occupies an important position, and it would be contrary to our interests that Russia should obtain any predominating influence within its borders. Our frontier policy for many years past, and until 1876, was definite and on the whole consistent, and was carried out in our dealings with the Beloochees as well as with the Afghans. It may be described as one of conciliation, mediation, and subsidies. Whilst avoiding interference in their internal feuds, and carefully abstaining from any appearance of annexation, we have been desirous of maintaining strong and friendly powers beyond our borders. In dealing with such half-savage suspicious neighbours, much tact and forbearance were necessary; but on the whole, until lately, we had every reason to congratulate ourselves on the success of our efforts. The reports of the Punjab Government, dated October 1876,* show that the Afghan frontier generally was becoming quiet, the population Trans-Indus increasing, and agriculture more general. Fron-

* Parliamentary Papers, Beloochistan, No. 3, 1878.

tier raids were less frequent, and were gradually being treated rather as matters of police than as requiring military punitive expeditions.

With respect to the Government at Cabul, the Earl of Northbrook, Viceroy of India, and his Council, writing in January 1876, alluding to the policy heretofore pursued, said :—

‘We already see the fruits of the conciliatory policy which has been pursued since 1869, in the consolidation of the Ameer’s power and the establishment of a strong government on our frontier. The Ameer’s not unnatural dread of our interference in his internal affairs, and the difficulties of his position as described in our despatch of the 7th June last, combined, perhaps, with the conviction that, if ever a struggle for the independence of Afghanistan should come, we must in our own interest help him, may have induced him to assume a colder attitude towards us than we should desire. But we have no reason to believe that he has any desire to prefer the friendship of other Powers. We are convinced that a patient adherence to the policy adopted towards Afghanistan by Lord Canning, Lord Lawrence, and Lord Mayo, which it has been our earnest endeavour to maintain, presents the greatest promise of the eventual establishment of our relations with the Ameer on a satisfactory footing.’

A reference to the Parliamentary Papers on the subject of Beloochistan also shows that during Lord Northbrook’s administration, after most protracted and patient negotiations with the Khan of Khelat, we had not only reconciled his differences with ourselves, but had successfully mediated between him and his turbulent chiefs. Up to the spring of 1876 it is therefore evident that, in a political sense, we had no reason to be dissatisfied with the general bearing of our border neighbours; and, in a military point of view, the frontier was safe and comparatively peaceful—in fact, remarkably so, considering its great extent and the lawless habits of those with whom we had to deal.

It is not proposed to enter now into a consideration of the sudden change of policy in 1876, resulting in the war of 1878. These are political topics, and it is rather to the military aspect of the changes effected by the Treaty of Gundamuk that a few words may be usefully devoted. The rectification of our frontier in the north-west appears to have been based on the general idea that, having a chain of mountains in our front, averaging between 8,000 and 10,000 feet in height, and extending for hundreds of miles down the border, it was incumbent upon us to hold possession of the chief passes by advancing to the other end of the defiles; and it was conceived that, by doing so, we should be able effectually to close the main entrances to Hindostan. These were the views constantly put forward at the

time, and apparently accepted by the Government. The Marquis of Salisbury, speaking at Manchester in October last, said :—

‘How stands Afghanistan with regard to India? Some people talk of our splendid mountain frontier, as presented by the Suliman mountains. A mountain frontier is a splendid thing, I quite admit, but on one condition, and that is, that the mountain belongs to you, or, at least, that the crest of the mountain belongs to you. But if the mountain from the top to the bottom, where it melts into the valley, belongs to some one else, and that some one else happens to be the person against whom you wish to protect yourself, I say, even in the presence of the distinguished military authorities you see assembled here this evening, that mountain position in that sense is the worst frontier you can possibly have. That was the state of things with respect to Afghanistan. As long as Afghanistan was in the possession of endless fighting tribes, with no particular connexion with any power outside their borders, no doubt such a frontier was quite sufficient; but as time went on, a great European Power advanced to Khiva and to the base of the Caspian Sea, and that to a very great extent modified the problem.’

Were the north-west frontier of India bounded by a single line of mountains, and were the country beyond them open and accessible, the proposal to hold the main passes of the range would be in conformity with the ordinary principles of strategy. Unfortunately, however, the circumstances are entirely different. The Suliman range, which runs down our Afghan border, is not an isolated chain, but merely the outer scarp, as it were, of a great labyrinth of mountains, extending behind it for hundreds of miles, and which, combined with narrow valleys and high stony plateaux, make up the whole country of Afghanistan. It is but the outer edge of great ranges which ramify in every direction, intersected by gorges, defiles, and valleys, defying all strategical intermediate lines, and running away until they culminate in the distant snowy ridges of the Hindoo-Koosh.

These circumstances entirely alter the aspect of the case; and no advanced posts, a short distance within the Afghan territory, will therefore serve the intended purpose. A short consideration of the new positions conceded to us by the Treaty of Gundamak in May last will make it clear that they do not constitute a frontier at all in the ordinary meaning of the term. They have no lateral communications with each other, and can only be reinforced from the rear; they are merely points of anxiety beyond our border. Our advanced posts in the Khyber and the Koorum are (as the crow flies) not far apart from each other; but between them, and entirely separating them, is the lofty ridge of the Safed Koh, its

peaks being between 12,000 and 15,000 feet high, and in parts covered with eternal snow. The new station in the Khyber has in its rear unhealthy dangerous defiles, flanked on both sides by high mountains inhabited by unconquered hostile tribes. It really commands nothing, and its maintenance must at all times be difficult and costly. General Hamley, in his lecture at the United Service Institution on the 'Strategical Conditions of our Indian North-West Frontier,' expressed himself as quite opposed to our taking up such a position. He said: 'If a point in advance of the Khyber were the knot where a number of roads united, which led from thence into the Indus valley, the policy of occupying it would be obvious. But it covers nothing, and commands nothing but the pass itself. . . . I think, therefore, there is much to be said against, nothing for, the occupation of a post beyond the Khyber, and that it would be a source not of strength, but of weakness.'

The Koorum is a long narrow valley of limited supplies, enclosed, north, south, and west, by high mountains, inhabited by the various sections of the great Afreedee and Wuzeeree tribes, who cordially detest our presence in their country. It was supposed to afford an easy access to Cabul, but as the only path leads over the Shuturgarden Pass, upwards of 12,000 feet high, it is not in any respect a prudent line of communication; and although Sir Frederic Roberts in his recent advance overcame the difficulties for the moment, he had no sooner reached Cabul than he found himself compelled to sever his connexion with the Koorum, the Shuturgarden becoming blocked with snow in winter. For the moment he was *en l'air*, and he had to trust entirely to the opening of a new line, through the defiles of the Khyber, in order to restore his communications with India. It is evident, therefore, that the strategic value of the Koorum valley has been miscalculated, and that our position in it, in a military sense, is false.

General Hamley's remarks are so much to the point, that a further quotation will help to elucidate the subject.

'Apart,' he says, 'from the question of a more formidable foe, it appears to be believed that these posts pushed up the passes would lessen the chances of future contests with the unruly hill-tribes. That they are unruly would appear an excellent reason for keeping them in our front rather than in our rear. Posts separated by such distances and such inaccessible country can exercise no influence on the inhabitants between; on the contrary we should thus be offering them new and potent means of molesting us. I fear that slenderly escorted convoys would offer irresistible temptations to the half-starved hill-tribes. Such a measure then, in time of war most mischievous, as

multiplying chances of disaster, would be in time of peace costly and burdensome, for it would not in the least obviate the necessity of keeping up our present line of frontier guards.'

While the rectification of our frontier in the north-west has thus led us into considerable complications in pursuit of a shadow when the substance was already in our grasp, the events which have marked our advance since 1876 from Scinde through the Bolan are still more important. Whilst in the north-west we have knocked our heads as it were against stone walls, and by entering the mountains have at great cost provided a battle-ground for our frontier forces which will apparently afford them occupation for years to come, in the south our movements have been still more rapid and daring, and, both in their military and political results, seem likely to lead to annexation on a large scale, and to a general advance of our line into the very heart of Central Asia. By the new treaty of 1876 with the Khan of Khelat we permanently occupied Quetta, a post on the confines of Afghanistan, about 200 miles from the Indus, and separated from it by an unhealthy desert and by the defiles of the Bolan. A movement of this kind must from its nature greatly alter our position as regards Beloochistan; and the Khan of Khelat, with the main route through his country in our hands, has lost any real independence he may have heretofore possessed. Events have followed so quickly on our occupation of Quetta in 1877, that the importance of the change has hardly been realised. The war of 1878 at once carried our troops to Candahar, 200 miles still further on the same road; and although, by the Treaty of Gundamuk, we were bound to withdraw to the valley of Pisheen, such stipulations have already almost become waste paper, and decided views are now held that we should on no account relinquish our occupation of Candahar. Even before the assassination of our Envoy at Cabul in September last, Sir Henry Rawlinson, who appears to exercise so great an influence in these questions, expressed a strong opinion not only on this point, but on the general policy to be pursued in Afghanistan. He goes so far as to suggest that we should assist the Turcomans—who, be it observed, are upwards of 1,000 miles off, and with whom we are in no way connected—that we should assist these savage marauders with arms and money to enable them to resist the Russian advance from the Caspian. Regarding Candahar, he says:—

'It would be almost fatuity at such a moment to withdraw our garrison from Candahar. Yakoob Khan must be made to see that it

is as much for his interest as our own to hold an efficient body of troops in such a position that, on the approach of danger, and without any semblance or suspicion of interference with Afghan rights, they might with military alacrity occupy Herat as an auxiliary garrison.*

It is certainly remarkable that Sir Henry Rawlinson, who is so sensitive in regard to Russian encroachments in Central Asia, should see no inconsistency in our forcibly seizing one position after another in a country to which we have no claim. It is also apparent that the march of our forces for 400 miles through the territories of two other powers, and the permanent occupation of Quetta and Candahar, must lead to military and political results of the highest consequence. To hold a long line of communication across deserts, through defiles, and over mountains inhabited by hostile tribes, must, in a military sense alone, entail great precautions and considerable expenditure, and all pretence to a frontier be for the time abandoned. The political consequences, however, will be still wider and more far-reaching. The very fact that our flag is flying above the ramparts of Candahar will at once lead to an extension of our influence in an ever widening circle, the limits of which it will be very difficult to control or define. Candahar, if retained, must inevitably become a centre of conquest and annexation.

The time, however, has arrived when these remarks must be brought to a close. Whilst they are being written another war is raging in Afghanistan, and about forty-five thousand of our troops, with 160 field-guns, are now engaged in all the hardships of a winter campaign in one of the most difficult countries in the world. Sher Ali is dead, his son Yakoob a prisoner in our hands, the Treaty of Gundamak is already mere waste paper, and the new frontier an arrangement of the past.

These events, in their broad features, were neither unexpected nor unforeseen. Lord Lytton himself, in his despatch of the 7th of July last,† said:—

‘When forced to declare hostilities against the Ameer Sher Ali, we were warned by several high authorities that a short or a small Afghan war would prove to be impossible; that we should be opposed in overwhelming numbers by the independent tribes; . . . that we should be confronted by a united Afghan nation; that, having once crossed the frontier, we could not safely arrest our progress till we had completed the entire conquest of Afghanistan; that such a conquest could

* ‘Results of the Afghan War,’ by Major-General Sir H. Rawlinson, Nineteenth Century, August 1879.

† Parliamentary Paper, Afghanistan, No. 7, 1879.

not be abandoned without the risk of renewing, and perhaps aggravating, our political dangers, nor yet maintained without heavily augmenting our financial and administrative burdens; and that in either case our utmost military success would bequeath to the Afghan people, whether as neighbours or as subjects, memories and sentiments of inextinguishable animosity; leaving to ourselves no practical alternative between the helpless contemplation of the confusion and anarchy created by our own action and the wholesale annexation of a barren country and a turbulent people.'

Lord Lytton unfortunately did not place faith in these warnings, but said that he and the Government of India 'were satisfied, by their knowledge of the actual condition of Afghanistan at the time hostilities were declared, that no such dangers need be incurred if adequate precautions were taken to avoid them'!

It is impossible to foresee as yet the outcome of the new campaign in which our troops are now engaged, or to say how far its ever-changing phases may carry us onwards. It is evident that an exaggerated fear of the power of Russia in Central Asia, combined with the vain pursuit of a phantom frontier, has already led us into vast expenditure and deplorable complications.

It forms no part of our design in this article to continue the discussion of the political results likely to follow from our interference in Afghanistan, on which we fully expressed our opinion in the last number of this Journal. We hold that in endeavouring to escape from an imaginary danger the Government has fallen into a real and serious one, notwithstanding General Roberts's brilliant victory.

The position of our forces in Afghanistan at the present moment is one of considerable difficulty, and indeed of anxiety: and although no doubt, in a military point of view, success will ultimately be achieved, the political consequences of our advance are more serious than ever; and every day's experience adds fresh proofs of the imprudence of the policy lately pursued by the Government on the north-west frontier of our Indian Empire.

ART. IV.—*New Ireland.* By A. M. SULLIVAN. Sixth Edition. London and Dublin : 1878.

THE book which stands at the head of this article has reached its sixth edition, and there is much in it that accounts for its popularity. In a series of vivid sketches, it presents us with an animated retrospect of Irish history during a period of singularly varied interest and picturesque detail. This tale of forty years is one of a very mixed texture, one that is read with many a sigh and many a smile ; but, in spite of the frequent blunders as well as successes which it records, it is, in the main, a tale of progress. We shall have to refer to Mr. Sullivan's book more than once in the remarks which we propose to make on the present condition of Ireland, and on the chief means through which her progress is likely to be maintained, and made one with the progress of the Empire.

Ireland has been for some time in a state of excitement which, though far less profound than active on the surface, though to a large extent artificially got up, and though little alarming when compared with that of days gone by, when a population of nearly nine millions sent its swarms to the monster meetings of 1843, is, notwithstanding, a remarkable phenomenon, and one well worthy, not of declamation, but of grave reflection. It is therefore without surprise or alarm, though certainly not without indignation, that we have read accounts of not a few among the meetings held in Ireland during the autumn—meetings at which a string of hysterical declamations has led up to resolutions too absurd to affect legislation, but not too ridiculous to excite angry passions, to tear open old wounds, to fill empty heads with foolish hopes, to depress Ireland's most long-tried friends—many of them men bent upon helping their poorer neighbours through a season of distress by judicious employment, but resolved not to yield to intimidation—and to irritate into inactivity legislators whose task, as regards the regeneration of Ireland, though far advanced upon its way, has by no means reached its completion. At some of those meetings speeches have been made calling on the tenantry of Ireland at once to cast off the authority of the law, and to trample under foot their deliberate engagements. They are exhorted to pay no rent whatsoever, whether able to pay it or not, unless their landlord has previously bound himself to abandon whatever proportion of it he is summoned to relinquish at the dictation of an interested party, the self-created

judge in his own cause.* Amid these incendiary speeches there have been heard (unless all the reports are fallacious), besides insults to the Queen and the Legislature, cries of 'Shoot the landlords.' In other words, a wholesale scheme of robbery has been enlivened by occasional threats of murder. Such scandals have taken place at meetings at which Mr. Parnell held the most conspicuous place, or at which other members of Parliament attached to the 'obstructive' sect were present. We do not read that those outcries suffered frequent or effectual rebuke, though we know that they incurred it occasionally, and though we can hardly suppose that they were generally approved, considering that those present, when not shocked by them as criminal, must have regarded them as inopportune. The 'tenant right' of an earlier day sometimes meant the right of the tenant to the property of his landlord. As interpreted by such outcries, the 'right' now advocated would seem to include his right to the landlord's life, at least in the estimate of enthusiastic spirits. That such meetings represent a small but noisy minority of the people of Ireland we can well believe, even irrespectively of the following extract from an excellent letter in which these excesses are condemned by Dr. MacEvilly, Roman Catholic Bishop of Galway:—

'May I again impress on all concerned, that any violent, unconstitutional, and defiant language, far from doing good, would do positive mischief, and estrange all who might be disposed to come to our rescue? And in speaking thus I feel *I am only giving expression to, and faithfully interpreting, the feelings and wishes of what might emphatically be termed the people of Galway.* Only men who, for aught I know, may be enjoying, or at least expecting, the wages of iniquity for betraying our people, could sanction or promote such conduct.'

The more modest of the demands made at these meetings

* Numberless resolutions have been passed, binding all who voted for them to this course, pledging them to take no land from which a tenant is evicted for the non-payment of the present rents, and pronouncing that any shopkeeper or tenant-farmer who takes such land is 'the enemy of the people.' In a letter in which he says that his frankness of speech will probably cost him his Parliamentary seat, Sir George Bowyer comments thus on such proceedings: 'These people are Catholics. . . . I say advisedly that no one, priest or layman, can produce any theological authority, from St. Thomas Aquinas to the penny Catechism, to gainsay the proposition that a tenant who refuses to pay as much rent as he is able to pay, and deliberately "sticks to the homestead and the land" which belongs to the landlord, is guilty of mortal sin within the meaning of the Commandment, "Thou shalt not steal."'

were those known of old under the names of 'rents by arbitration,' and 'fixity of tenure.' To these is now added one of a more sublime order. The State is to constitute the present occupiers proprietors of their farms. This scheme is to be executed in one of two ways; according to the more genial one, the landlords are to be compensated, the Government borrowing for that end a sum amounting perhaps to nearly half the national debt (though some think that the 'Church surplus' might suffice); while the other is vague and leaves them to the uncovenanted mercies of the State.

Let us apply ourselves first to the milder of the proposed remedies—'rents by arbitration.' Is it necessary to remark that wherever rent exists there already exists a contract between the proprietor of the farm and its occupier; a contract voluntarily entered into after consideration, bargaining, and public competition; a contract secured by the law, which protects alike the proprietor of the land and the tenant, and corroborated, for the benefit of each, by the same moral sanctions? Saving certain reservations necessary for the general needs of the community, the right of the proprietor to his land has been recognised and guarded by law no less than the rights of the tenant, and by no means in the interests only of the existing proprietor class. It has been guarded by new laws as well as by old, including laws the especial object of which was to facilitate the acquisition of landed property by a class previously unconnected with it, but willing to entrust to the land, as the securest of banks, the hoarded gains of a lifelong industry. The merchant returned from abroad, the retired manufacturer with his thousands, and the shopkeeper with his hundreds, have bought land because it was a thing of which the rights were secured, and the value therefore known. Nor is this all. The mortgagee was no less guaranteed against loss by that law which protected property. Create a new system of 'rents by arbitration,' and the old contract is at an end, and all that rests upon it must share its fall. To diminish the landlord's profit from his estate, and increase that of the tenants, against the will of one of the contracting parties, would be a confiscation as much as the reduction of the mortgagee's covenanted rate of interest. To reduce the rental of an estate by one-half is the same thing as to alienate a moiety of that estate. If popular urgency prevailed once, why should it not prevail a second time and a third? If a bad season had in 1880 reduced rents to one-half, why should not a similar plea ten years later reduce them to a quarter, till by degrees rent had melted away like King Lear's train of attendants? If landed property

was thus dealt with, why should personal property be spared? Why should the contract made with the fundholder be more sacred than that between landlord and tenant? Why should the farmer who had cheated a kindly landlord be bound to a usurious money-lender? Why should not the labourer cheat both?

Have those who talk about 'rents by arbitration' ever determined who the arbiters are to be? If they were the nominees of the landlords, the tenants could hardly accept them; if of the tenants, the landlords would demur; if of an officer appointed by the Government, the landlord and the tenant would alike have a right to say that their new master was in the interest of their rival. Obviously the proposed change would not be the substitution of a better for a worse form of contract; it would be the abolition of all contract whatsoever, for freedom is of the very essence of contract. If the landlord be obliged by law to let his farm for what he deems half its value, he is no more a free man than a tenant would be who was compelled by the same law to pay a rent which he deemed to be twice its value. Such a law would practically be the substitution of arbitrary sway for freedom in all transactions connected with land tenure. Arbitration could only be consistent with freedom of contract when the landlord and tenant had conjointly elected the arbiter, an act which needs no change of law, and would produce no notable change of any sort. Why stop at *rents* by arbitration? The rate of wages might no less be determined by law-appointed arbitrators; that is, the freedom of contract might in this matter also yield to a new form of serfdom legally compelling the labourer to work for inadequate hire, or the employer to pay wages which left him no profit; but the consequence would be that employment would cease, and that between the two classes of society there would be a race to ruin in which the weaker would win. The price of food might in turn be regulated by law; but the consequence would be that farmers would think twice before they produced it, and merchants before they imported it. High prices are nature's warning that food must be economised, and thus there ensues distress only where otherwise there would have been famine. Wages may be rendered low by many circumstances—for instance, by an abnormal competition of labourer with labourer—and rents may be made high by an abnormal competition of farmer with farmer. But these are also nature's warnings, and they point to real remedies, not to quack medicines found in the violation of nature's laws. Burke, whose writings did so much for the religious liberties of Ireland on the

one hand, and for the exposure, on the other, of Jacobinism masked in the disguise of liberty and patriotism, has left behind him many lessons not unworthy of attention among his fellow-countrymen. Certain benevolent country gentlemen in England 'had dined,' he remarks, before they issued a manifesto affirming that the best cure for a scarcity then prevalent was to be found in a rule fixing the rate of wages. He reminds the sentimentalists who declaim against political economy that true economical laws are 'laws of nature, and that the laws of 'nature are the laws of God.'

Let us not be misunderstood. We by no means assert that a man's estate is his property simply in the same sense in which his horse is, and that he would be justified in discarding his tenants as he dismisses his grooms. Far otherwise. There are very sacred relations connected with land—relations witnessed to by the moral sense of the individual, by the public opinion of society, and by many provisions of law, such as those clauses in the recent Land Act which throw obstacles in the way of *capricious* evictions, but of these alone. We simply affirm that, with other relations, some of a strictly commercial character are inseparably mixed wherever property exists, and that for the right adjustment of these, whether connected with land, with trade, or with manufactures, freedom of contract is an essential condition.

'Fixity of tenure' would but aggravate the evils produced through 'rent by arbitration,' and give them longer time to work. With changed conditions the arbitration battle would be renewed again and again, those conditions presenting themselves in an opposite light to the contending parties. One party would plead the depreciated value of that produce which made the rent, the other the depreciated value of the coin in which it was paid; one the value of the improvements, the other the fourfold value of those resources, latent in the soil, out of which they had been cheaply made. If the tenant had prospered, he would urge that his family had acquired new notions about comforts; if he had failed, that he had large debts. In either case a further reduction would be demanded. The rent, depressed in a bad season, would not be raised again in a good one. Yet the ruin of the tenant would, in numberless cases, be at least as certain as that of the landlord. During the intervals between arbitration and arbitration he would have his times of difficulty if his rent even approached to a fair rent; but he would not find those aids which an ordinarily good landlord now gives at such times, both from kindly feeling and out of a wise self-interest. He would

neither be a real proprietor nor a real tenant. He would very frequently become idle, and hope that the next reduction of rent would set all right. No one acquainted with Ireland is ignorant that the tenants, even where the rents are high, are often not in misery so squalid as may be found on farms confessedly underlet; or that, in past times, 'middlemen,' who had their farms almost for nothing, after extorting a rack-rent of their own from under-tenants, often lived and died in penury. When the small farmer had fallen into arrear and also into debt, he would be bought out by a neighbour, or by an artisan from a neighbouring village, and the depopulation process would go on more rapidly than it has done for many a year.

The injury would not be confined to the classes connected with land. The main effect of a change which, by annulling freedom of contract, deprived property of all security, would be to discourage, in all classes alike, that energy and enterprise of which property is the reward. Gambling and hoarding are the modes in which men seek wealth, if they seek it at all, when secure property is not allowed to reward prudent exertion; but it is other habits than these which produce national prosperity. For the improvement of Ireland nothing is more needed than the growth of a prosperous middle class; her past circumstances opposed hindrances to the existence of such a class, and circumstances of a different kind render its progress still timid and tentative. These circumstances may be described by the general term insecurity. In place of that peace and respect for law which favours the investment of capital and its reproductive employment, Ireland has too often had strikes, social strifes, political agitations, illegal societies, threatening notices. We shall hardly mitigate these evils by adding to them a social revolution, at war with the first principles on which property rests, and enkindling a new war between classes, just after the last cause for mutual alienation—an unjust sectarian ascendancy—has been removed. The growth of a middle class thus indefinitely checked, what would be the character of the higher class? Of whom would it consist? Of proprietors in name, incapable of exercising a function or discharging a duty belonging to proprietors—a body of landed annuitants, as impotent as reduced and pensioned Indian princes—men condemned to perpetual idleness, and regarded as drones by those whom they in turn regarded as robbers.

Absenteeism is one of the few evils equally admitted to be such by all those who have discussed Irish interests, some writers enlarging on the injury done by it to the moral rela-

tions of society, while others have inveighed against it yet more loudly as a drain upon Irish capital. 'Resident landlords ought to be,' it is said, "captains of industry." But 'absentees consume the produce of the land, and give what 'remains to strangers.' Those only who are acquainted with Ireland know how often and under what discouraging circumstances her resident landlords have been the only 'captains of industry,' how often they have been the hardest worked men on their estates, and how long they have persevered in such toils, in spite both of disappointment and misrepresentation. Many of them toiled early and late on relief committees in the famine time,* and not a few heartily supported Mr. Gladstone's Land Act. The effect of that Act is thus described by Lord Emly: † 'The value of the interest in their 'holdings conferred on the tenants of Ireland by the Land Act 'of 1870 is, in the opinion of the best statistician in Ireland, 'between seventy-five and seventy-seven millions;' the return bestowed on those Irish proprietors without whose aid that Act could hardly have become law—their return, not on the part of their tenantry, nor of the people of Ireland, but of agitators and their dupes, has been the cry, 'Down with landlordism!' Is it certain that those resident landlords, about two-thirds of the Irish proprietor class, when deprived alike of duties and of respect, would continue to reside on the lands their own but in name? But if they withdrew, whatever remained to them of their rents would be withdrawn from Irish industry just at the time when capital was most needed for the inauguration of the new agricultural experiment; and the numberless dependants hitherto employed in their houses, their gardens, and their parks, would add a new contingent to the ranks of labourers without work, and have to leave their native land.

Let us now proceed from schemes which are already regarded

* Mr. A. M. Sullivan pays a generous tribute to the conduct of the Irish landlords generally during the great Famine. 'The bulk of the 'resident Irish landlords manfully did their best in that dread hour.' He adds in a note: 'No adequate tribute has ever been paid to the 'memory of those Irish landlords—and they were men of every party 'and creed—who perished martyrs to duty in that awful time; who did 'not fly the plague-reeking workhouse, or fever-tainted court. Their 'names would make a goodly roll of honour. . . . Cases might be named 'by the score in which such men scorned to avert by pressure on their 'suffering tenantry the fate they saw impending over themselves. They '“went down with the ship.”' (*New Ireland*, pp. 63-4.)

† Inaugural Address at the 28th Session of the Statistical Society (Dublin), by Lord Emly.

as tame by many of those who once advanced them with misgivings, and consider the more advanced platform of the revolutionary party. The engine runs all the faster along the rails when it carries no train with it, and possibly the speed with which these new engineers have been careering over the land of fancy may owe something to a lurking suspicion that to their triumphal car no burden in the way of practical consequences will be found attached. For the moment, however, the cry in the ascendant is that of a 'Peasant Proprietary.' Out of scores of meetings we will refer to one held at Enniscorthy, at which 15,000 persons, including three Members of Parliament, were said to have been present. The second resolution, moved by Mr. Parnell, ends thus:—'Resolved, that we regard the rejection of our abnormal system and the establishment, instead, of a peasant proprietary to be the only effectual remedy for the agricultural and trade depression which are fast sinking this oppressed land into cureless ruin.' Another meeting at Killala made the same demand: 'As the land laws of this country are the offspring of an alien hostility to the social and political well-being of its people, and are responsible for the misery and destitution into which they are periodically thrown, we demand their abolition as an essential requisite to the contentment and prosperity of Ireland, which condition requires the substitution for the present system of one that will establish the cultivator of the soil as its *sole proprietor*.'

Such is the plan: it is no scheme for admitting a class of peasant proprietors into the social system: it is, as here plainly stated, the extermination of the existing proprietors. As to the mode of carrying the scheme into execution the inventors of it differ. Some cut their way through those difficulties *sans phrase*; they would simply transfer the land to the present occupiers, at no cost to the country, and without consulting the present proprietors, who should consider themselves as well off if allowed a small portion of their actual rent for twenty or thirty years. It is needless to discuss such a scheme. Apart from all considerations of conscience or honour, expediency prescribes an exterior compliance with certain decencies, and governments which may at any time have to borrow cannot forfeit all credit till the time has come for the declaration of a national bankruptcy. No doubt, when society is in a state of dissolution, it shakes off its mortal burden, finds itself delivered from that downward gravitation which some philosophers regard as humiliating, and may suddenly go rushing all abroad on the wings of a billion of *assignats*; but till that supreme hour arrives it must keep its feet in

the known ways of business-like honesty. This first plan, therefore, can but be regarded as ideal, and put aside as impracticable. Let us proceed to the next, but not without first tendering our thanks to those who would not, as they intimate, deprive the landlords of their estates without at the same time preserving to them their game-rights over the whole of them!

A second scheme has been proposed, milder to landlords, but tolerably stringent as regards the community at large. The State is to borrow a sum equal to the rental of Ireland capitalised, to purchase the whole landed property, and to transfer it to the occupiers. According to some the occupiers are to receive this boon gratis; according to others, they are to purchase their farms from the State, paying for it, principal and interest, by instalments extending over thirty-five years, after which time the land is to be theirs rent free and for ever. This transaction, it is urged, presents no difficulty, as the Government can raise money at a low rate of interest.

On the second of these suppositions the State is to raise a sum amounting to several hundreds of millions, at the cost of all persons in the United Kingdom, no matter how poor, who pay taxes directly or indirectly, and to bestow that sum upon the farmers of Ireland. As for the occupiers, supposing them to be suddenly relieved from all obligations, they would be tested as severely as children suddenly made their own masters. Those who have not qualified themselves for a new position seldom turn its resources to good account, or resist its temptations. A farmer who, by exceptional industry and skill, has laid up a portion of the money necessary to purchase his farm, is likely to prosper as a small proprietor; everyone must desire that all legal and needless obstacles to his attaining that position should be removed; and the landed proprietor must rejoice more than others, since a new class of competitors for landed property would increase its value, and an increased number of proprietors its security, the pyramid becoming consolidated in proportion as its base became extended. But to place the whole body of the occupying class in the position of small proprietors by external legislation would to them be the most fatal of boons. It would prevent them from ever acquiring those characteristics without which they could not retain their new position. All things work according to character. To the disciplined and the resolute the 'magic of property' is the strongest inducement to improve; to those of a soft temperament, unaccustomed to enterprise, even when not deficient in industry, and with but slight knowledge of agriculture, it would be the

strongest inducement to sloth. Help there would be none from the co-operation of a good landlord, and the warning of immediate danger there would be none from non-payment of rent. Dean Swift's two rules for his fellow-countrymen—'Do nothing for yourself which you can get another to do for you; and do nothing to-day which you can possibly do to-morrow'—would carry with them a stronger allurements than ever. The money-lender would be at hand, the shopkeeper would give accommodation, and debts would accumulate. How much more fatal than it now is would not the money-lenders' snare prove to petty proprietors suddenly invested with the power to mortgage their little properties! Other evils, and all tending in the same direction, would follow. Those properties would be divided and subdivided among the children of the peasant proprietor; while in many cases a new set of minor tenants would crop up upon the old farm, and the new proprietor would be forced by his necessities to exact more than the old. Even in the case of tenancies watched by the eye of landlord and agent, it has been found no easy task to put into execution the laws intended to prevent sub-letting. The upshot of the experiment would not improbably be that the original proprietors would eventually employ the huge sum awarded to them by the State in buying back again the greater part of their alienated property at a greatly reduced price, and proportionately diminished in value.

A result not very dissimilar would probably be reached if the State, in place of making a present of their holdings to the occupiers, required them to refund the purchase-money by a series of half-yearly payments. The experiment would have a better chance; and in some cases the peasant purchasers, their energies braced by the necessity of meeting a large annual demand, would doubtless work through a long and difficult period of probation. But the trial would be hard indeed. The fallacy that the Government could raise some three or four hundred millions at a cheap rate would vanish when the vastness of the operation had largely raised the value of money. To indemnify itself within any moderate time, the Government would have to require an annual payment far exceeding the previous rent. The sole landlord would be the State—not only an absent, but an invisible landlord, and immeasurably the hardest of all possible landlords. The strong hand of this terrible landlord would be felt everywhere. It would be no question of a good season or a bad season, a good crop or a bad crop, good prices or reduced prices. Come what might, the Government would have to pay the interest of the purchase-

money, and the peasant proprietor would have to pay his instalment. He might, indeed, cry aloud in his wrath, like old John of Gaunt—

‘Landlord of England art thou now, not king;’

but his own ill-advisers, not the State, would have created the preposterous condition.*

That the State should accept the position of national landlord is of course impossible; but as the new philosophy rests on this hypothesis, let us assume it to be realised. What would follow? First, it would have rendered permanent (at least in theory) that system of very minute holdings, in a large measure the result of bad legislation in past times, which every one knows to be inconsistent with Ireland’s well-being or safety. There were in Ireland in 1871 about 74,000 holdings under five acres each, and about 170,000 between five and fifteen acres. There are also in Ireland immense industrial resources, the development of which needs but the sense of security. If, in place of scaring away Irish capital, the so-called friends of Ireland invited English capital to a land where these natural advantages, and a rate of wages comparatively low (supposing the labour given to be honest labour), would ensure for it a large return, many of those who still crowd the poorest districts in Ireland would be found to have voluntarily migrated, not to remote regions, but to new centres of commercial industry in their native land. Is the State to hinder

* We have before us at this moment two examples of what peasant proprietorship in Ireland really means. The first case is an appeal from the poor inhabitants of the parish of Templecrone in the county of Donegal, who represent themselves to be in a state of starvation. These persons are peasant proprietors. They bought small patches of mountain land from the Commission of Church Temporalities. The price was low, and the payment was to be made in instalments payable over thirty-five years for three-quarters of the amount; the fourth quarter was borrowed at 10 per cent. The crops having failed, these proprietors are utterly unable to pay either purchase-money or interest, or to find means of subsistence. ‘They are largely in debt, and have nothing to fall back upon.’ Again, in the diocese of Armagh, a rich part of the country, similar purchases have been made by peasant proprietors from the Church Commissioners on the same terms. But since the recent agitation against rent, these purchasers utterly refuse to pay their instalments to the Commission, and the process-servers have been so savagely threatened that they refuse to act. This is evidently what would happen if public money were advanced by the State to enable tenants to buy up their holdings.

the natural effects of time and peace by proclaiming that the present holdings are perpetual? If it is to do all this, how is it to collect its annual instalments? Is it in times of scarcity to evict a whole province of Ireland, to secure the interest on the Irish land-fund? Would this have been a kindly mode of treating the famine some thirty years ago? Would it be a sagacious mode of meeting a general election by ballot at some critical period in the future? There are those to whom everything in politics is either a game or a jest. To such persons the Legislature itself is but a jester playing cards. They remember Belinda, and as

“Let Spades be trumps,” she said, and trumps they were,”

they do not see why the State should not go into a grave business ‘with a light heart,’ cry ‘Let tenants be landlords,’ and leave the table before the result is declared.

The excitement having first been raised by promises as vague as they were large, a more moderate tone has lately been taken by some. They say that the State should go through its work gradually, raising the necessary fund by degrees, and buying out the landlords first in one part of the country, and then in another. In that case, as the proposed metamorphosis of occupier into proprietor is to take place for the benefit of the poor, it would naturally begin, not where the farmers are richest, as among the rich pastures of Meath, but rather in those tracts of the west where there is most of poverty and insecurity, possibly in Connaught. Some of the results would be singular. The change would have been made largely in the supposed interest of the ancient Irish race, but the occupier changed into a proprietor would occasionally be an immigrant from England or Scotland settled upon lands left desolate by the late famine (in the north of course but a small minority of the new peasant proprietors would be of the Irish stock); while the proprietor reduced would often belong to the Ireland of old times, and might be the descendant of one of those northern proprietors dispossessed and driven into Connaught, to make room for the ‘Ulster Plantation’ of King James I.

But the main result would probably be something more than a surprise to those who are now loudest in favour of change.

Suppose the experiment to have been tried. In the event of its failure—that is, of a general bankruptcy—what would be the only part left to the sole surviving landlord, the State? Interest, necessity, and duty, would all point in the same direction. It would have but the alternative of leaving its helpless clients to starve or of helping them to emigrate. Here

again the difficulty would have been smoothed away ; for those who now cry out against assisted emigration would then ardently desire it, as multitudes did in the famine years. It is easier now than it was then to help the destitute across the ocean, and to find remunerative work for them in remote lands. The new order of things would then have set in ; new proprietors (for the State would be but too glad to relinquish its involuntary honours as sole landlord), and new tenants ; but the old relation between landlord and tenant would remain, and the old principle upon which it was founded—the freedom of contract. In other words, the endeavour to impart arbitrarily a nominal perpetuity to a system in itself accidental and full of anomalies would but have proved its *reductio ad absurdum*, and effected its extinction.

It seems hardly worth while to indicate the lesser incoherencies in a project which is all incoherency. The Irish National Land League has declared in one of its manifestoes, that their great social revolution can only be effected by the concentrated efforts of *all* the industrial classes in Ireland, not those only who are connected with land. But how can merchants and manufacturers, bankers, shopkeepers, and money-lenders, whose interests depend entirely on freedom of contract, join a league to destroy it ? If the landlords have no right to their property, does it follow from this that the land belongs exclusively to the occupiers ? Certainly not on the ground that in ancient Irish times it belonged to any such class. In those times it belonged, with the exception of a small portion set apart for the support of the chief, to the clan collectively, a precedent which would admit the labourers not less than the occupiers to an equal share of the soil. Or is the occupier's exclusive claim derived from an abstract theory ? But here again the 'Rights of Man' would claim an equal share for all living on the soil ; they would not transfer fifty acres of it to one man, and to another five, or perhaps none, merely because he chanced to stand lower on the roll of agricultural heraldry, or had been less favoured by a dispossessed usurper.

Let it not be thought that we have made too much of the recent agitation. We have spoken of it in its practical bearings and as it has been understood by the misguided multitudes summoned to its meetings. No doubt some of the speakers guarded themselves to a certain extent by the use of equivocal language ; but those who flocked to those meetings with banners, and those who accompanied the speakers with the cry, ' We want no ' monarchy,' or ' An ounce of lead for the landlords,' under-

stood that, whether or not the proprietors were to be compensated, the landed property of Ireland was to be transferred to the occupiers, and that with no long delay. The plan of operations was distinctly marked out for them by the leaders. No rents were to be paid until the landlord had made the reduction demanded of him; and, if consequently a tenant was evicted, no one was to be allowed to take the vacant farm.

All that the daring and the noisy could do they did, till, to those who did not know that there commonly remains among the mass of the people a saving common sense not counted on by those who would lead them astray, it might have seemed that their voice was the voice of all Ireland. Mr. Canning described such modes of procedure more than sixty years ago, explaining how, 'when, by a species of political ventriloquism, the 'same voice' is made to resound back from every part of the country, the ignorant imagine that the confusion of echoes which reverberates around them is the unanimous voice of a people. Where proof could not be found from the past or the present, the future was appealed to by the over-sanguine prophet. It was certain, he affirmed, that, as the summer had been all rain, the autumn would be all tempest. Harvest there would be none, and to speak of hope was to be a public enemy. But the harvest was not inferior on the whole, as many of the farmers have admitted, to the average harvest. The managers ought to have prayed for foul weather.

Those meetings, it is true, were not all of the same character; many of them limited their demands to subjects fairly open to debate; and at others, particular individuals had the courage to use plain expressions, which separated them from the responsibility that others incurred, whether by their language or by their silence. Mr. Shaw at Cork, and several speakers elsewhere, bore witness to the high character of the Irish proprietors as a body, and allowed that much exaggeration was used respecting the amount of distress. At the great meeting of the Dublin Corporation, Mr. Gray admitted that, though serious depression prevailed throughout Ireland, destitution was likely to be local, not general, and that a 'peasant proprietary' must be regarded as belonging only to a far future, though in three different modes it might be rehearsed, in the meantime, on a smaller scale. But, unhappily, in too many cases language of the most inflammatory character was used and applauded, as at Gurteen, where Mr. Michael Davitt, a released Fenian, proclaimed that 'fixity of tenure was 'simply fixity of landlordism—fixity of poverty and degradation. Abolition of landlordism was the only certain remedy.'

‘Landlordism’ he stigmatised as ‘conspiracy,’ an expression borrowed apparently from the celebrated dictum of the Communists, ‘Property is theft.’

At a meeting held in Galway, Mr. Parnell is reported to have said ‘he had been charged with trying to drive the landlords out of their properties, and put the land in the hands of the tenantry, without compensation; but there were worse men than him, men whose numbers were increasing every day, who thought that the tenants of Ireland had purchased the land of Ireland from the landlords four or five times over in rent during the last 300 years. . . . If the tenants stuck to their holdings, and refused to pay an unjust rent, their case was gained.’ At a meeting of the Irish National Land League, Mr. Parnell put forward his plan for creating a peasant proprietary in detail. A member of that body, Mr. Sweetman, opposed that plan as confiscation, and, being defeated on a division, wrote thus to the secretaries:—

I must request you to remove my name from the Committee of the Irish National Land League. I do so as I cannot agree with Mr. Parnell, its founder and president, in his new demand that landlords, in consideration of having two-thirds of their fair rents purchased from them, should be deprived of the remaining one-third at the end of thirty-five years. From my knowledge of Irish tenants and labourers, I feel sure that the vast majority of them have no wish that Catholic Ireland should make such demands.*

It cannot be pleaded, except rhetorically, that the language held at those meetings was not understood by the mass of those who heard it to mean confiscation, merely because the resolutions did not specify in terms that the ousted proprietors were

* If we are to rely on several reports of Mr. Parnell’s speeches, it is not one-third part of each Irish estate that is to be confiscated after the lapse of thirty or thirty-five years, according to his plan, but the whole of it. According to a report in the ‘Standard’ of his speech at Manchester (November 10) he is stated to have distinctly explained that compensation is no part of his plan, though he has no objection to it. In another speech, after admitting that the Legislature would be slow, except under strong pressure, to ‘expropriate’ the Irish landlords ‘by force,’ Mr. Parnell is reported in the same journal to have thus continued: ‘I have pointed out that we had besides the estates of the London Companies, and the estates of the absentee owners, which we might fairly call upon the Government forcibly to expropriate. I have stopped short up to the present time at resident owners who live in the country, who are not rackrenters, and do their duty, but I cannot say the line will continue to be drawn even with them in the future, and that if these times and this pressure are to proceed the whole institution of landlordism will not come down together.’

to receive no compensation and to be asked for no consent. Were details respecting such particulars needed to make the excited multitudes understand the meaning of a resolution passed at Athenry, one expressing an aspiration that 'the toiling tillers of the Irish soil . . . should be rescued at last from the cruel capriciousness and grudging tyranny of the *felonious feudalism* which has for centuries brought such unnumbered and unspeakable woes upon the tenantry of this down-trodden and impoverished country'? In dealing with felons it is not necessary to discuss the question of compensation. Were such details necessary to render intelligible Mr. Parnell's statement as to the *ulterior* ends of the present land agitation: 'so long as there was a class in Ireland—a class of landlords and aristocrats—invested with privileges and rights such as they now saw, so long would English misgovernment be upheld in the country. . . . Let us see, as in 1782, one hundred thousand swords, both Catholic and Protestant, leaping from their scabbards; and believe me, my fellow countrymen, it will not be a question of chicanery, or of Acts of Parliament, or of anything that can possibly interfere between the right of our people to make their own laws on the soil of Ireland.* It is no wonder if, shortly after some of these meetings were held, we read of the attempted assassination of Lord Sligo's agent, and of the letters ordering Lord Headfort and his agent to prepare for death. Soon after it was reported:—'Threatening notices were posted yesterday on the Mahon estate near Clare, in the King's County. They threatened any tenant with death who paid rent on the estate pending an arrangement between the landlord and the tenantry. . . . The tenants on an adjoining property have been similarly threatened.' Next appeared a notice at Tallagh, warning any persons who proposed for land from which a tenant had been evicted, or caused the rent to be raised in any part of the country, that they had better leave their length and breadth with the undertaker.' It was probably in connexion with such incidents that Mr. Brennan, as reported, made the following appeal at the meeting of the Mayo National League, November 22:—'I appeal to one class in the community especially—I appeal to the men of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and I ask them are they content to remain or to become the destroyers of their people; of their own kith and kin?'

* Mr. Parnell's speech at Liverpool as reported in the 'Freeman's Journal.'

It is a relief, after the perusal of such proceedings, to read the following denunciation of them in the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin's Pastoral of November 17, which must have been felt as a severe rebuke by many of those who had taken part in the proceedings so censured:—

'Very rev. fathers, whilst standing forward to support our flocks in this their dark hour of distress, we must not fear to raise our voices to warn them against the results of their faults or mistakes. Our principle must be to give to Cæsar what Cæsar justly claims, else we cannot give to God what God commands. If just debts, fairly demanded, be not honestly discharged, a principle fatal to the prosperity of our country will be established, and sooner or later it will recoil on the heads of those who to-day may seem to be gainers by its adoption.

'But let us pray, rev. fathers, that the day may be yet far distant when Irishmen, who in olden times were renowned for their love of impartial justice, should set to the world an example of faith disregarded.'

The appeal to Irishmen in the last paragraph can hardly have been made in vain. They at least have ever maintained that, in those stormy centuries happily gone by, the struggles of Ireland were directed not only to the defence of Liberty, but of Justice, of Faith, and of ancient authorities, by her regarded as legitimate, and the objects of her passionate loyalty. Jacobinism of course knows nothing of such virtues; and its triumph would do what nothing else has ever been able to effect:—it would fix a gulf of endless separation between that past Ireland dear to true Irish hearts, and the Ireland of the present and the future.

The 'Irish National Land League,' in its address to the farmers of Ireland, uses language significant to those who can 'read between the lines.' 'The *agitation* for reduction of excessive rents must be sustained, so that *the operation of natural causes* may be assisted in bringing land to a *fair valuation*,* in order to enable its cultivators to become the owners of their own farms upon terms *within the means of every occupier*.' Many of the devices by which an arti-

* The meaning of a 'fair valuation' is suggested by the following extract from a printed document circulated through Westmeath when the Land Agitation was at its height: 'Land must come down to its proper value, about 2s. 6d. or 5s. per acre. The farmers of Great Britain and Ireland must have land that will enable them to compete with the freeholders of America. Away with landed monopoly! If you want tenant-right, if you want leave to live on the land of your birth, send no landlords to Parliament. As well send wolves to guard sheep.'

ficial excitement has been kept up during the last few months are explained by those words. Abolish the 'felonious' feudalism' of the existing land-tenure if possible; but, in any case, lower the rents! With this view everything has been done to misrepresent the present system of land-tenure. 'Compare,' it is said, 'the agricultural prices of the present year with those of 1875, and then ask whether the tenant can be expected to pay his rent.' But the reply is obvious: the fair comparison is between the prices of the present year and the prices when the rent was determined. Many of the existing rents were agreed upon soon after the great famine; and others, though at a later time, yet at one when prices were lower than they are now.

It is often alleged that the tenant is practically obliged to undertake the payment of whatever rent may be demanded, because 'tenancies-at-will' prevail so largely that he may at any moment lose his holding. Tenancies-at-will, so far from being generally regarded as necessarily insecure, have not seldom been preferred by the tenant to a lease. No doubt they are liable to abuse, and to guard against capricious evictions, or the threat of such, clauses of the most stringent kind were introduced into the recent 'Land Act,' which give to the outgoing tenant in such cases not only the value of his unexhausted improvements, but also compensation for the loss of his holding, amounting in some instances to seven years' rent. Moreover, the pretence that fair competition is now forbidden receives a conclusive confutation from the fact that an outgoing tenant has been often able to sell the 'goodwill' of his farm at a sum sufficient to purchase its fee-simple, and that even in the present year it retains a high value. A tenant who can get a dozen years' rent for his interest in a farm can hardly be said to have had a hard rent forced upon him. The value of the tenant's interest as a marketable commodity varies with the times like the rent itself, a proof that his contract has been a free one. In making these remarks we do not conceal our preference for the system of leases over that of tenancies-at-will in Ireland. The more completely the tenant *feels* his independence the better;—but the landlord has a right to be free no less.

The last consideration reminds us of another sophism frequently reiterated. Those who admit that the great majority of landlords act with justice and humanity, and that important changes in the law have been made to meet the exceptional instances, often assert that so long as a *possibility* of hardship exists the system of land-tenure must be a wrong. This is declama-

tion. On such a principle all the relations of society should be dissolved, because we cannot ensure their working perfectly. No laws could prevent the *possibility* of the tenant's cheating his landlord which did not deprive that tenant of all freedom of action; and for a similar reason there will remain, under the best laws, a possibility of the landlord as well as of the professional man, the master, or the servant, acting unjustly in some particular case. Law should make these cases as exceptional as possible, and when they occur should punish them; and behind the action of law there remains that of public opinion. It is the imagination, not the understanding, that expands in the region of the possible. True statesmanlike prudence deals with the probable and the practical. To go beyond this is not to protect individual rights, but to paralyse all the social energies.

Unquestionably it is a time of depression in Ireland. In those parts of the country where the population is at all times poorest, and still remains most dependent on the potato, a crop which in many places is sadly deficient, there is but too much reason to fear that a serious scarcity of food will occur, aggravated by a great deficiency of turf—a deficiency which will affect the labourer far more than the farmer, as he can less afford to buy coal, but one which is no part of the 'land question.' This painful truth has been attested, not only by many private individuals belonging to all parties, but by four authoritative documents, viz., by the statement of the 'Assistant Commissioners of the Royal Agricultural Commission;' by the Report to the Lord Lieutenant from the 'Local Government Board;' by the 'Declaration of seventy Irish Members of Parliament;' and by the 'Declaration of the Catholic Bishops and Archbishops.' The last is expressed with great moderation of language, asserting the inadequacy of the Poor Law alone to meet distress such as they anticipate; asking for public employment as calculated at once 'to relieve the present pressing wants of the people, and be productive of permanent benefit;' 'bearing testimony to the generous conduct of many landlords;' and exhorting their flocks 'to act under their trials with Christian patience and charity; to help each other to the utmost of their ability; to respect the rights of others; to pay their just debts to the fullest extent of their means.' The Irish members of Parliament express their belief 'that the distress will be severe and widespread during the coming winter and spring,' and 'ask for assistance to works of a permanent and useful character.' The Report of the 'Local

'Government Board' states that 'there will not be more than 'half an average crop' of potatoes; that in many parts of Ireland during the winter 'considerable distress and destitution, 'as well as increased demands for relief, may be expected, 'owing to the failure of the turf supply and to scarcity of 'employment;' that poor-rate charges are already rising; and that, especially in Connaught, the depression is chiefly caused by 'reduction in prices obtained for cattle and pigs, and by the 'farmers being deeply in debt to money-lenders and shop-keepers.' No doubt the depressed condition has proceeded chiefly from a fall of prices consequent on foreign competition. But it results also from another cause which has found little place in the recent declamations. During the last few years the farmers, trusting to the permanence of those prices, have gone seriously into debt in too many instances; and that which presses most heavily upon them is not the rent, but the claim of the bank or of the money-lender, a person much harder to deal with than the landlord. The interest charged by the banks, which have of late largely multiplied their branch establishments, varies, on these occasions, from five to eight per cent. : from fifteen to twenty per cent. (per ann.) is a rate not uncommonly received by the money-lenders.

The following striking statement on this subject was made by Judge Barron in his address to the grand jury of the county of Monaghan :—

'There could be no doubt that the forbearance of the landlords was desirable and necessary in these times; and he was struck by reading a number of resolutions entered into a few days ago by the Roman Catholic clergy of the diocese of Kilmore. These resolutions breathed nothing but a gentle and judicious spirit. They asked the creditors of the tenants to show Christian forbearance so far as their means would permit, and not unnecessarily to harass those whom they had allowed to run accounts on their books to a wonderful extent. He (Mr. Barron) was one of those who had thought that the Land Act would do the farmer a great deal of good, and he thought it had done so in some respects. But he was bound to say it had one bad result—it had allowed farmers to contract debts which are perfectly fabulous. . . . They (the merchants) had said to themselves, "Here is a man who has "five or ten or fifteen acres of land which is value for 30*l.* an acre : "that is ample security for anything I can give him." . . . An intelligent farmer had told him a day or two ago that an abatement of 20 per cent. to farmers would be only to them like a drop in the ocean, and that, even if the landlords did not ask their tenants for a farthing of their rents for the next five years, they would not be out of their difficulties.'

To the same effect were the remarks addressed to the grand

jury by Mr. Thomas Lefroy, Q.C., County Court Judge for the counties of Louth and Armagh.

‘A yearly tenant of five or six acres, from the extravagant value set upon tenant-right, where it exists, or the extravagant claims for disturbance-improvements, where it does not exist, will get credit to an amount, I am sorry to say, he knows he can never meet. In this way, knowing that he has a real or an imaginary claim, he mortgages his property three or four times over. When he has thus mortgaged this five or six acres—such is the greed for land—if three or four acres come into the market he goes and buys the tenant-right at ten times its value. Not having money to meet this, he goes to a money-lender, which, I must say, is the last and a bad resource. I have had cases before me in which tenants have paid 40 per cent. to money-lenders, 8*d.* in the pound for twenty-one days.’

It is well known that, encouraged by the high prices of recent years, the Irish farmers have been living in a much more expensive way than in past times. This, in itself, is of course no subject of complaint, if only the progress were real progress, and had not rested on debt. Among the more educated classes improved circumstances lead every day to the same lack of prudence. But in the higher and the lower grades of society the same errors have to be expiated in the same way. If the bad times foreboded by some should indeed be before Ireland, the imprudent landlord must suffer as well as the imprudent tenant; nay, the prudent must also partake the common loss. In the meantime let the tenant shun, as the most fatal of snares, the voice of the seducer who says to him, ‘On your landlord alone should fall the blow!’ Whether you exercised foresight or built upon borrowed and fictitious resources, you must live as if good times were perpetual; and if for this a revolution is necessary, a revolution there must be. If you have shown yourself incompetent as an occupier, the only remedy is that you should become ‘a proprietor.’ The effect of acting on such persuasions would be this:—the Legislature would cease from legislative reforms which only aggravated discontent; and landlords deprived of their rents would decline to give employment on the lands of which, as they were informed, they were so soon to be dispossessed.

In the interests of Ireland not less than those of the Empire, we are obliged strenuously to resist these destructive measures, for such we deem them without doubting that they have found advocates among men of sincere though mistaken patriotism. We refer to such measures as ‘Home Rule’ or ‘Repeal of the Union.’ The question is not as to

the means by which the legislative union was effected. The price paid for that measure was indeed of a far different sort from that which ought to have been paid, and was promised, viz., Catholic Emancipation. Emancipation was deferred until twenty-nine years had been spent in agitation. On the other hand, the swiftest, not the justest, mode of action was unfortunately employed to carry that necessary measure, the parliamentary fusion of two countries, which neither the wars of many centuries, nor dynastic changes, nor diversity of religion, nor the intervention of foreign States, had ever been able to separate. If Pitt's intentions had been carried into effect, the Union would speedily have been associated with Catholic Emancipation and the other remedial measures with which he proposed to accompany that settlement. The Repeal of the Union, after stopping all that has long been going on of improvement, and surrendering Ireland for an indefinite period to internecine faction fights, would end either in the dismemberment of the Empire, in civil war, or more probably in the renewal of the Union at the request of Ireland herself.

Protesting, then, against all visionary and revolutionary proposals, we protest equally against all measures which practically lead in the same direction—that is, such measures as, under the plea of removing abuses, would place the whole local government of Ireland in the hands of those who have as yet had least of political education. It is in no such direction that the weal of Ireland is to be sought. Her progress is to be expected from a policy that advances by degrees, but advances upon known roads, and allows time for the quiet working of the great reforms already made. Since the passing of Catholic Emancipation Ireland has had corporation reform, an enlarged franchise, a vast system of primary education, religious equality, the removal of sectarian ascendancy, the reform of the land-tenure, a good measure for intermediate education, and a measure for university education likely, after some easy but most necessary modifications, to be accepted by all classes. Notwithstanding the depression of the present time, her children have also made an amount of material progress in some respects not surpassed by that made in any other European country. Compare the present state of things with that which filled the heart of Bishop Doyle well-nigh with despair. Turn to those lists of reform measures the enactment of which Mr. O'Connell more than once declared would render needless the demand for Repeal—measures nearly all of which have substantially become law—and then ask are we to abandon all this solid good for schemes some of which those eminent men

would have scouted as the device of an enemy? Are we to leave our half-ripe harvests to rot while we go in pursuit of a will-o'-the-wisp? In protesting against political remedies which are worse than the disease, we raise no cry of 'finality.' It is not practical ameliorations that we deprecate, but needless organic changes leading to revolution. No doubt several of the great measures already passed admit of such ameliorations; that is, of ameliorations suggested by experience and necessary in order to carry out their principles more effectually in detail. But our decided protest against the wholesale creation by law of a 'peasant proprietary' as the gravest injustice to the proprietor, and the most fatal of boons to the occupier, in no degree stands in the way of such modification of the celebrated 'Bright clauses' as would remove obstacles to their working. In 1877 Mr. Shaw Lefevre's motion for a committee to enquire into the working of the Bright clauses of the Land Act met with the unanimous support of Irish members of all parties. The Report is the more valuable, from the high character of the witnesses examined; and its recommendations are very important, especially the following:—

'Some provision must be made to meet what the evidence shows to be the fundamental difficulty of the present system; that is to say, the difficulty, if not impossibility (save in rare instances), of forming the lands into lots to suit the tenant purchasers, and at the same time paying due regard to the interests of those whose property is being sold through the Court. So long as these practically inconsistent duties continue to be imposed on one and the same functionary, your committee believe that no substantial result can reasonably be expected from the clauses of the Irish Land Act to which their enquiry has been directed. They therefore think that whilst leaving to one body the function of selling to the best advantage such estates as may be offered for sale, another distinct and equally independent body should be constituted, specially charged with the duty of superintending and facilitating the purchase of their several farms by the occupying tenants. . . . Your committee are of opinion that the body thus constituted should put themselves into communication with the tenants of properties offered for sale in the Landed Estates Court; should explain to them the facilities offered by the Act; should represent their interests before the Court in lotting of interests of properties or otherwise; and should only purchase and resell properties in lots as aforesaid when satisfied that such a proportion of the tenants are prepared to buy as will prevent any loss to the funds at their disposal. . . . Evidence has been laid before your committee in reference to the lessening of the costs of the transfer of land generally in Ireland; and they consider that a change in this direction is desirable, as favouring the purchase of land by occupying tenants.'

It has been, as is generally supposed, from such defects in the 'Bright clauses' of the Land Act, that not more than 710 occupiers have bought their own farms at sales under that Act, while above 5,000 have done so under the Church Act.

The cause of this diversity was thus accounted for by Mr. Gray, M.P., in his speech at the meeting of the Dublin Corporation on the 30th of October last: 'That has been owing, not to any want of desire on the part of the tenants to purchase, but to difficulties in the working of that Act, and principally owing to the fact that all the tenants must buy or none can buy.' It should be remembered, however, that the landlord must remain free to accept for his estate the highest price it will fetch, whether in a single large bid or in many small bids; and no less that if competent and incompetent farmers were induced to join in a common purchase, it could be to the first class only that benefit would accrue. Companies and private individuals have before now assisted industrious farmers to change their holdings into small properties. Whatever can be done through wise and just laws to promote that end will at once reward merit, and multiply the defenders of property against destructive schemes. It will also dispel too sanguine expectations. Where some succeed others will fail; but in the meantime the 'survival of the fittest' will doubtless preserve and enlarge the class of peasant proprietors *thus* produced in a degree exactly proportioned to its merits. All depends on the man himself, and Acts of Parliament cannot create character, though time and experience may discipline it.

Emigration aided by the Government is another of the plans recommended as a help to Ireland. We can see no reason for thinking such assistance necessary, or likely to become necessary; and nothing is more enervating than unnecessary assistance. The wildest exaggerations have been used to utilise a period of general depression and local distress by representing it as the forerunner of a famine like that under which Ireland laboured thirty years ago. The sufferings of that terrible time might indeed have been much mitigated by a well-considered measure of emigration, aided by other measures for helping the newly landed emigrants to the fields of colonial employment, and for stimulating those public works so useful in young countries. But since that time the population of Ireland has diminished by one-third, and it has ceased to depend exclusively on the potato. The recurrence, therefore, of any such famine is utterly improbable. In these

days of submarine telegraphs and ocean steamers, food can be procured in a sixth part of the time then necessary, and with the help of railways it can be distributed in Ireland with a proportionate celerity. Before we speak of assisted emigration, let us see how far Ireland is able to assist herself in this matter. During several of the famine years her emigrants were probably not less than 200,000 in number, though, for lack of needful aids, the class of emigrants was not always the right class, while their sufferings were far greater than they need have been and included a terrible mortality from fever, both on their passage and on their landing. As the condition of Ireland improved, that vast exodus diminished by degrees to one-half, a third, a fourth, and a fifth of what it had been. During the famine years the Irish in America sent a million sterling annually, and at one time a million and a half, to their friends in Ireland, to assist them in emigrating. Considering that the American Irish are now a far more numerous and a wealthier body than they were then, it is probable that they would forward larger sums if any necessity for such aid were to recur. Without Government aid the Irish emigration between May, 1851, and December, 1869, amounted to nearly 2,000,000. Between 1873 and 1877 it decreased as follows:—In 1873 to 90,149; in 1874 to 73,184; in 1875 to 51,462; in 1876 to 37,587; while in 1877 it rose to above 38,000. It is likely that the renewed prosperity of America will of itself attract a larger number to the labour markets of that country than have recently proceeded thither.

If however in some parts of Ireland there still exists a local congestion of population, there can be few modes in which the local aid of the poor rate could be more fitly employed than in help to the emigrant. It is not improbable, indeed, that certain schemes for an enlarged Poor Law area rating might, if restricted to assisting emigration at periods of distress, confer benefits unattended by peril. But large measures of emigration at the cost of the State should be reserved for times of famine far spread and unquestioned. Such aid, when not required, might easily aggravate the evil it was intended to mitigate, and interfere with those natural processes through which society adjusts itself to circumstances, and heals its own wounds. During a period of depression, as labour is less remunerative than usual, a large number of labourers are of course thrown out of employment. In ordinary cases better times come, and with them renewed employment. If in the meantime some huge system of State emigration had greatly diminished a population in ordinary times not out of fair

proportion to the resources of the country and to its capital, such a reduction in the numbers of the labouring class would probably, when improved times returned, raise the rate of wages so high as to prevent employment from being given on a large scale. That class would thus have been permanently injured by an interference intended to remove a temporary trial; and industrial progress would have been indefinitely checked. Such would be the consequences, whether the State emigration had been meant to relieve the agricultural labourers of Mayo or the manufacturing labourers of Lancashire. Local agencies have a finer sensitiveness and a stronger elasticity than governmental; they can better appreciate the amount of the difficulty, proportion their interference to the occasion, and diminish it as the need passes. There was a time when a population extraordinarily excessive, not when compared with the vast resources, but with the capital, of Ireland, condemned her to a chronic pauperism. A terrible crisis bequeathed to her a far less suffering, but by no means a perfect, state. If security were not denied to her by false political ideals and reckless agitation, capital would rapidly flow into her, providing for her sons other industries besides those connected with the soil, and thus enabling her to fight the battle of civilisation with two hands, not with one only. Like other excellent things, emigration may be carried too far; nor does the snapping of that tie which binds the emigrant to hearth and home always contribute as much to his happiness or to his moral well-being as to his material prosperity. Prudence can sometimes become as exaggerated as imagination itself; and there are some who seem to think that, because Ireland had once too large a population, and gave herself too much to second-class agriculture, she can never be too sparsely inhabited, and ought to return to an earlier stage of civilisation, not exactly the hunter stage, but that of the life exclusively pastoral. This is not Imperial policy; the vast resources of both Ireland and England were given for other ends. As a nation may be over-populated, so it may be under-populated, till it is neither able to contend with other nations in the arts of peace, nor to defend its limits in times of war.

We come next to the important question of 'Relief works,' an expression used in different senses, and too often connected with demands not likely to redound either to the advantage of Ireland or to her self-respect. Some extravagant petitions, occasionally for State gifts, but more often for loans nearly certain to be never repaid, have assumed a more grotesque

character because made by those who, almost in the same breath, hurled defiance against the State which was to bestow the gift, and the proprietors who were to guarantee the loan. This odd mixture of menace and supplication must not, however, blind us to the fact that persons of unquestionable judgment have also made suggestions, though of a very different character, respecting works to be undertaken by local proprietors, but aided by the State. The two classes of propositions have to be separately considered.

As regards the first, there is nothing whatever in the depressed condition generally prevalent in Ireland to justify any demand for an Imperial gift. Such gifts are doubtless necessary in cases of famine, vast and terrible like those which so frequently desolate huge tracts of India; and if, during the cotton famine, all England had resembled Lancashire, doubtless they would have been largely bestowed on her, as they were on Ireland in her great famine. Where the necessity does not exist, to invoke such aid is to substitute an ignoble dependence on others for manly self-reliance and for those virtues of endurance and exertion which the occasion requires.

If such a famine were again to visit Ireland, the experience of that terrible time shows that 'Relief works' would be the worst remedy for it. 1st. Relief works, if reproductive, must commonly lie in districts far apart; but in such a famine the need for aid is everywhere; consequently, while in a few districts men earn more than they need, in the greater number they are left without relief. 2ndly. Even in the more fortunate districts the relief is absorbed by the able-bodied and their families, while thousands incapable of labour, and with none to help them, are left to starve. 3rdly. An immense accumulation of labourers is thus drawn from the districts unrelieved to the scattered relief works, the necessary consequence being lawlessness and confusion. During the great Irish famine it was found necessary that the Relief works, so unfortunately undertaken, should be near each other. The consequence was, that those works were for the most part only nominally productive—generally roads where none were needed, and often left unfinished. The people soon discovered the 'pious fraud.' Labour has its moral as well as its commercial relations:—it is the sense that his labour does good that sweetens the labourer's toil, and ennobles it. Deprive labour of those relations—make it a mere test of destitution—and you convert it into a mockery. The works being discovered to be sham works, the labourers in too many cases resolved to spend only sham labour upon them; combination

became easy, and the better disposed were often overruled by the lawless. Those works were abandoned, though not till millions had been thrown away: in place of them the cheapest food was distributed from numerous depôts to those who needed it most; and four times as much good was done at a fourth part of the cost. In short, neither productive nor unproductive 'Relief works' can do more than partial good when called upon to meet a general famine; and, unless managed with great skill, they are apt to increase the distress and to prolong it. Another evil is also thus engendered. The people are taught to believe that a Government is bound to provide employment and wages for all who cannot otherwise procure them. This of course is Communism, in philosophy, and in practice it means that the individual is not bound to provide for himself by prudence or by forethought; nay, that he may decline all assistance that does not suit his taste or favour his ulterior aims; and that, notwithstanding, the State is compelled by a primary political duty to secure for him those two things, work and wages, over which it has no more permanent control than over the winds and tides. Employment thus guaranteed under all circumstances would be more dangerous than the *panes et circenses* of the Roman Empire.

The objection against 'Relief works' undertaken at the cost of the State applies alike whether the aid be called a gift or a loan, unless there is a moral certainty that the loan can be and will be repaid. This consideration brings us to suggestions respecting employment aided by the State, but exclusively on strict conditions of repayment, which have been put forward by many private individuals certain to speak on the subject with knowledge and disinterestedness, like Colonel King Harman, Mr. Bagwell, and the Knight of Kerry; as well as by the Corporations of Dublin and other cities, and many Poor Law Boards. Their suggestions refer to works to which the name of 'Relief works' cannot properly belong, since they are described as being such reproductive works as the Legislature has frequently assisted in Ireland and elsewhere, when no relief was asked for, and no special distress existed, simply on the ground that their prosecution must give a large impulse to collateral industries. Respecting one of these works, arterial drainage, Mr. J. G. McCarthy, M.P., writes thus:—

'The commencement of practical legislation on the subject was made by Sir Robert Peel's Act of 1842, amended by the Summary Proceedings Act of 1846. These measures were marked by the largeness of view and boldness of treatment which characterised that states-

man. They enabled the Board of Works, as a department of the State, to undertake the great national work of arterial drainage, charging the cost on the land improved. Vigorous efforts were made to take advantage of this legislation; landlords and tenants worked together; every county, almost every barony, made its proposals; 452 districts were surveyed, and 122 districts, comprising 270,000 acres, were reclaimed. Of the remaining districts, 300 were under consideration; and it was estimated that ten years would complete them. But in the midst of the work came the famine. Under the pressure of that terrible calamity financial considerations were overlooked. Money was spent with both hands; and when it came to be repaid poor rates had risen to 16s. in the pound, and fee-simple lands, with Parliamentary title, were selling at five years' purchase. Large remissions had to be made; and the undertaking of new works was prohibited by Treasury minute.'

It would thus appear that the 'Relief works' were introduced and 'Reproductive works' discarded at the same period—a thing to excite no surprise, since they were based upon opposite principles. Mr. McCarthy proceeds:—

'To remedy this state of things I brought in the Waste Lands (Ireland) Bill of 1875. It was substantially an embodiment of Lord John Russell's proposal of 1844. . . . The then Chief Secretary, Sir M. Hicks-Beach, admitted that "the attention of the House could "hardly be occupied with any question of greater importance."'

In times of depression there will always, however, be a tendency to confound genuine Reproductive works with very doubtful 'Relief works.' To avoid this danger the State, as we conceive, should aid no works not morally certain to prove remunerative, even though she be herself secured, from other sources, against loss. Mr. McCarthy regards the reclamation of mountain wastes as likely to be remunerative, and adds, 'But if any deficit should arise, a portion of the Church surplus 'could not be better employed than in reimbursement.' We wholly dissent from that suggestion, both on the ground we have already stated and on others also. A million acres of mountain waste he acknowledges to be irreclaimable; but he cites high authorities which affirm that very large tracts would pay for being brought into cultivation. This may be or may not be; but experience has proved that far larger and more secure profits are made by changing good land into better, than worthless into tolerably good. As civilisation and science advance, the improved land will be ever gaining 'advantage 'o'er the kingdom' of the bad; and it seems as well that the process should be a gradual one, as that every acre should be brought at once into full cultivation, and no further margin left for growing numbers. But it appears to us, to be a

vicious and mischievous principle that the community at large should be taxed, and the revenue burdened, in order to assist speculative improvements which are much better left to private enterprise.

From questions relating chiefly to the material interests of Ireland, we pass to two of a moral character, which have at least as close a connexion with her eventual well-being. It may be observed that many of the remedial proposals lately advocated in Ireland include the suggestion that the 'Surplus Fund' of the Disestablished Church should be used in order to carry them into execution. There is the more reason to regard this suggestion with anxiety, since, coming from Ireland, it may blind many persons to the permanent injury which it would inflict upon that country in the hope of mitigating a transient distress. The subject is one of such importance, and of an importance so likely to be overlooked amid the press and tumult of matters more immediately urgent, that we cannot pass it by unnoticed, though to do it justice would be impossible within the space at our command. The Church surplus is the small remaining portion of that national reserve fund which, in all the nobler European nations, when the mass of the land became divided into innumerable proprietorships, still remained unappropriated, the possession of the nation itself. It was never intended for the promotion of material interests; it made provision for interests both higher and more liable to be forgotten. Amid the chances and changes of material things, it provided for those moral, intellectual, and spiritual needs which undergo no change. The circumstances of Ireland rendered a reform necessary with regard to her Church property, which had been, three centuries before, unjustly transferred from the people at large to the use of a small minority; and about two-thirds of it having been spent in providing for the vested interests of existing incumbents, there remained a third for the permanent benefit of Ireland. That portion of the original national reserve was no longer to pay tithes to the clergy of any Church. It was placed apart; and a later Parliament, in the exercise of the same legislative powers which belonged to its predecessor, has since, on two occasions, appropriated a portion of it on a sound and far-sighted principle. It had soon been discovered that to spend that surplus in subsidising mere material interests would practically have been to exonerate the land, and therefore, in the long run, the landlords, from burdens which must otherwise have fallen upon the rates, or upon property generally.

The reserve fund, thus spent nominally for the benefit of the poor, would thus in reality have been alienated from them, and bestowed indirectly on the wealthier classes of society. A wiser course has been adopted. The primary religious purpose of the Church property having been set aside, the surplus has twice been devoted to what in legal phrase is called *cy près* purposes. Nearest to the directly religious needs of a people, and most akin to them, are its moral and intellectual needs. The session before last the Surplus was applied to Intermediate Education, through 'payment by results;' and last session to Primary Education, through increased grants to schoolmasters.

But more is needed. Something has been done towards the solution of another part of the education problem, viz., University education; but until more solid ground has been taken as to the principle on which that education is to rest—and here, again, the question of the Surplus Fund comes in—we can hardly say whether even a beginning has been really made. This question is one especially important in the discussion of Irish discontent. As regards its principle, we agree with the leading members of the Liberal party, who insisted that the Intermediate Education Act of 1878 had predetermined what that principle must be. There are concessions from which it is impossible to recede; and after the passing of that Act, with the hearty consent of both the great English parties, and the concurrence of Ireland, she had a right to conclude that the long education battle was over (the next session will probably show whether that conclusion is or is not to be confirmed), and a final settlement arrived at, not through the triumph of either of the extreme opinions for which men had fought so long, but through an honourable compromise which did justice to both. On the one side had stood the advocates of 'mixed education,' who, with a generous desire to put an end to narrow estrangements, maintained that those who were to work together as citizens in one State ought first to sit side by side in the same schools, and there to form youthful friendships. On the other side were those who replied that, valuable as social harmony unquestionably is, religion is yet more so; and that, unless education is interpenetrated by religion, from which it is unhappily impossible to separate contested doctrines, men will grow up irreligious, indifferent, and lax in morals. For thirty years the war raged, vast sections of society being apparently separated more and more by the effort to draw individuals closer together, till one was reminded of Jeremy Taylor's remark about ships which, if fastened together in a storm, dash each

other to pieces, whereas if they had had sea-room they would have been safe. Each side contended that the opinion it maintained should be exclusively endowed. A secular ascendancy, meantime, was created, and from it followed consequences which touched men in their consciences and in their pockets alike. Those who held by religious education—and in Ireland, as well as England and Scotland, they were the majority—were obliged as taxpayers to support a system which they disapproved, while they were also obliged to educate their sons at their own expense, and in a manner so inferior, as regards secular knowledge, to that enjoyed by their more fortunate rivals, that in the race of life there was no fair competition between the two classes. It became at last certain that those who believed in religious education, Ireland's devotion to which had been proved by her raising during the last thirty years about 200,000*l.* for the support of the Catholic University, were certain not to change their conviction. A Church Establishment three centuries old had been abolished for the sake of peace; and day by day it seemed less reasonable to miss that peace. It had been wisely affirmed by a Liberal Premier that Irish consciences and sympathies might be as much respected by an Imperial Parliament as Scotch principles and sympathies are; and that a Legislature seated at Westminster might consult for Ireland as impartially as if it sat in Dublin; but there still remained the Home Ruler's rejoinder—'On the contrary; on a grave matter of conscience Irish sentiments are not respected, and persistent inducements are held out to make Irish parents educate their children in a manner they believe to be morally wrong.'

From this unfortunate complication a deliverance was found, and one recommended by unimpeachable precedents. The same difficulty had presented itself when the Irish National system of education was first instituted. That system was assailed as irreligious; and, at the instance chiefly of the Protestants, but for the benefit of all, a second class of schools, the 'non-vested,' were added to it. In them it was permitted to teach religion with a large freedom, but also under a conscience clause to protect a minority. The more religious and the less religious schools have for many a year flourished side by side, the former class constituting three-fourths of the whole, while both classes are endowed by the State. More recently a double system had also been adopted in England, schools almost wholly secular being supported by rates, while denominational schools are liberally assisted out of general taxation. Such was, substantially, the principle adopted when

the Irish Intermediate Education Act was passed. Schools and colleges, whether Catholic, Protestant, or secular, received aid from the public funds, in proportion to the number of scholars whose secular proficiency had been tested through an examination recognised by the State. No question was to be asked as to whether or not they imparted religious instruction also at their own cost.

Unhappily the Government, in place of frankly basing their University Act of last session on the same principle, the principle of educational equality, propped it by an artificial contrivance which they could hardly have regarded as more than temporary, but which had in it one of the worst of faults—that of being equivocal. ‘Payment by results’ was again introduced, but in a different fashion. Payments are to be made to successful students; but it remains with the Senate of the new University to decide whether they are to be the rewards of ‘comparative’ or of ‘absolute’ merit. On the latter supposition all the students who pass the examinations will receive a certain sum of money, irrespective of lesser prizes; and, supposing that they transfer that sum to the Colleges which have prepared them for examination, the Colleges of the new University will then no doubt receive aid as the ‘Intermediate’ Colleges now receive it, though in a roundabout manner. But this benefit rests altogether upon three formidable peradventures. It presupposes that the Senate should elect to reward ‘absolute’ as well as ‘comparative’ merit; that the Government of the day, which retains the power both of appointing and of removing the great majority of the Senate, should approve of that course; and that students should hand over their earnings, or a large part of them, to their respective Colleges. There is nothing that excites so little of gratitude, and so much of suspicion, as concessions that may at any moment be retracted. These payments, even if made for a time, might be withdrawn, with or without a pretext, on a change of Government or of popular feeling; and in the meantime Colleges dependent upon the caprice of Ministries for their support might at any political crisis be assailed by aspersions on their independence, aspersions proceeding from some extreme party in Irish politics. It is obvious that this part of the recent University Act will have to be placed upon a more reliable foundation ere long; and it is no less certain that when that task is undertaken a serious difficulty may arise, if the fund out of which the new University Colleges are aided is to come from the general taxation of the country. On the other hand, few will be found to deny them what has been conceded

to the Intermediate Colleges, if the aid be accompanied by the same conditions and derived from the same source. That source, the Church Surplus, must therefore be regarded as sacred, and inviolably preserved. The conduct of the Opposition leaders, and especially of Mr. Forster, on this subject, and on the O'Connor Don's University Bill, presents a contrast to the vacillating course taken by the Government, which can hardly be soon forgotten in Ireland. The Ministry threw over, at the last moment, that plan for University education, founded on the principle acted on the preceding year, which the Irish Government had suggested to the representatives of the Irish Catholics, and which had met their approval.

It must be remembered that University education is by no means a thing in which the wealthy classes alone are concerned. Scotland, with a population far less than that of Ireland, has four Universities, to which 5,500 students belong. Of these, 25 per cent. are the sons of labourers and artisans, and have begun their education at the primary schools. Many of the schoolmasters have taken University degrees, and prepare their pupils both for the Intermediate schools and for the Universities, the transit from the lower to the higher grades of education being largely assisted by bursaries and scholarships. The University system of Ireland can never be considered as complete until the poorer classes have thus a share in its benefits. It was they who subscribed for the larger part of the sums collected for the Catholic University.

Besides that great educational question, one of the three, on the settlement of which Mr. Gladstone declared that the happy relations of England and Ireland depend, there remains another like it of a moral, not material, interest, the importance of which will be felt probably more and more as the problem of Ireland is more and more understood in its largeness. The wise settlement of that question, whenever it next becomes prominent, would be seriously impeded if what remains of the 'Church Surplus' were wasted. Without a brief allusion to it our remarks on the condition of Ireland, and on the measures needed for her amelioration, might justly be accused of bearing a one-sided character. We now pass to a second example of this. Our readers will hardly need to be reminded that when the great settlement of the Church question was made—a settlement which will doubtless be looked back on in future times as the great *sine quâ non* of Ireland's peace, and the security of the Empire—although the principle on which it was founded, viz. religious equality, was carried out

in the main, there was yet one notable exception, acknowledged by the most zealous supporters of the measure, and an attempt to correct which proved unsuccessful owing to the party complications of that agitated crisis. Tithes being abolished, the Protestant and Roman Catholic clergy were placed on the same footing thus far; but, as regards realised property, the difference between the two was no less than this: that the Roman Catholic clergy received nothing, whereas the Protestant clergy were allowed to retain, for a sum estimated by Mr. Bright as between 100,000*l.* and 150,000*l.*, a property in churches and parochial residences which Mr. Gladstone had originally estimated as worth at the least 2,500,000*l.*, and of which, at a later time, he said, 'Speaking of them as representing value, it would be impossible to attach to them a value of less than 3,000,000*l.*, even after allowing for the very large payments to be made on the glebe-houses.' Most wisely, as we think, he left those churches and residences in the hands of their possessors; for, independently of the difficulties which, as he remarked, would have attended their sale, a grave injury must otherwise have been inflicted without necessity on the members of the 'Disestablished Church.' No ungenerous objection was brought against this course either by Roman Catholic Members or by those who represented the 'voluntary system.' Of that body Mr. Bright was the most conspicuous representative; yet, opposed as he was to the principle of 'concurrent endowment,' he did not think a one-sided endowment preferable. He had himself made a proposal that out of the Church property 3,000,000*l.* should be set apart to provide residences *for all denominations*. The same opinion had been expressed at the preceding election by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. When interrogated, he answered that there must be residences either for the Protestant and Catholic clergy alike, or for neither.

In furtherance of that principle the Duke of Cleveland, as will be remembered, made his proposal that out of the Church Surplus 1,000,000*l.* should be used in order to provide residences for the Roman Catholic clergy; and a deeply interesting debate followed. We do not refer to it for the purpose of recommending that the question should be reopened at present. Should such a proposal revive sectarian heats, happily on the decline, it might retard, not accelerate, a legislative course at once beneficent and just. Our object is to show the utter impolicy of throwing obstacles in the way of that course at some future time. Should all reasonable men come to an agreement as regards the principle, the unreasonable will still

entrench themselves behind financial difficulties. Such difficulties would speedily vanish if there remained a portion of an exclusively Irish fund which had already provided residences for the Protestant clergy. That such a solution should have been rendered impossible at the instance of men who had dissipated that fund, while professing to speak in Ireland's name, would be no small paradox. The time of calmer judgments will come, and a rigid account may be demanded for national funds recklessly squandered. The Duke of Cleveland's proposal was supported by, amongst others, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishops of Oxford (Dr. Wilberforce), Gloucester and Bristol, St. David's (Dr. Thirlwall), and Peterborough; the Dukes of Cambridge, Leinster, Northumberland, Devonshire, and Somerset; the Marquis of Salisbury; Earls of Russell, Carnarvon, Devon, Grey, and Stanhope; Lords Eversley, Halifax, and Athlumney. Lord Russell supported the proposal with especial energy, declaring that the Government which carried it 'would receive that reward which would be justly due to Ministers who had healed the wounds of many centuries.' The late Earl of Dunraven also supported the measure strongly. Unfortunately this statesmanlike motion was thrown out by a majority of 146 to 113. On July 12, 1869, the proposal was again brought forward by Earl Stanhope, and carried by 121 to 114; but it was lost in the Commons.

Readers who turn to those debates will find that the proposal was urged, not upon abstract, and still less on polemical grounds, but as a matter of urgent and practical need, both social and political. They will find allusions to the extreme difficulty which an Irish priest often meets in procuring even the humblest residence near his church; of the difficulty which a curate has in pursuing his studies, or even in long retaining his books, in some hired room, dinned perhaps by the clamour of a drinking party under the same roof. They will read of worse troubles proceeding from the fewness of the churches, and the overgrown size of the parishes in many parts of Ireland; of the miles of mountain and moor to be crossed in the middle of the night to attend a 'sick call,' and the chance of the sick man having died before the priest has arrived. These things still remain, and with them the popular sentiment which such things leave behind them. A measure for facilitating the building of Roman Catholic presbyteries by loan has proved of little use, as might have been expected. It could least have been turned to account where aid is most required—that is, in the poorest districts. The whole status of the Irish Catholic

clergy is in a large measure determined by the lack of fit residences. The difficulties and degradations connected with this matter, more than any other discomforts proceeding from the 'voluntary system,' make parents reluctant to educate their sons for the ecclesiastical career, which is thus practically interdicted to many who, from their social position as well as their natural dispositions, would add a valuable element to the Irish priesthood. The Church settlement has of course put an end for ever to those ideas of pensions for the Roman Catholic clergy not seldom entertained by Liberal statesmen from the days of Pitt to those of Peel. For many years the scheme had been discountenanced alike by that clergy and by their flocks; yet it is remarkable that those who exclaimed most strongly 'the Irish would never trust a pensioned clergy,' commonly ended, 'of course glebe-houses would be another matter; by them 'no jealousy could be excited.' In other words, parochial residences were understood to mean, not dependence, but independence. Such residences, decorous and fit for a clergyman to live in—placed close to the church, and making the pastor feel that he belongs to it—unencumbered by a farm, but with a few trees, a field, and a garden—carry with them a moral influence over and above that share of material independence which they confer. Their occupant has something in common with very various grades of society: he can sympathise with all, while he is bound over to the class-prejudices of none. He is himself a proprietor, though it is among the poor that his duty and his affections lie; and though he has no ambition to acquire wealth or to bequeath it, he

'Enjoys the walks his predecessors trod,
Nor covets lineal rights in lands or towers.' *

We have now discussed the chief questions relating to Ireland which have lately been occupying attention, or which are certain to occupy it before long, and can but glance at a few others. One of these is the Grand Jury system. There can be no doubt that the existing system requires reform, because it involves taxation without adequate representation, since at the Presentment Sessions, the initiatory taxing body, the associated cess-payers, are not chosen by election. As little can we doubt that the reform needed is not to be sought in the rough and ready process of destroying the existing Grand Jury system. We concur in the principles enunciated by one who

* Wordsworth, 'Sonnet on a Scotch Manse.'

has had much experience in this matter. We quote from him : *—

‘The Grand Jury has kept its position by attending to its business, by the publicity of its proceedings, and by ceasing to job. We have now a body of men thoroughly trained to their work, and knowing how to do it; men who shrink from the imputation of dishonour; a tribunal holding in fiscal matters the power of veto, but not of initiation; a House of Lords, as it were. In this no change should be made; you must have men . . . above all superior to corruption, whether it be the coarse corruption of a bribe or the half-unconscious corruption under which men unduly favour or unduly disfavour others from motives arising from social or political relations—or the corruption of fear, that worst and most insidious of all corruptions.’ †

Certain limitations in the powers now exercised by Grand Juries are, however, necessary :—

‘If such alterations are made as will entirely deprive Grand Juries of all power of initiating or enlarging taxation to the smallest amount, the restraining, controlling, moderating power will best be exercised by a body selected as the Grand Juries now are.’

But while the local ‘House of Lords’ should be retained, the local ‘House of Commons’ should be thoroughly reformed.

‘The constitution of the Presentment Sessions, the initiatory taxing body, cannot be defended. The nomination of associated cess-payers by the Grand Jury is false in principle, and ridiculous in practice. It is really a nomination by a single irresponsible individual. . . . They should be elected as the Poor Law Guardians are, and should hold office for one, or perhaps for two, years; the qualification should be moderate; their number should be proportioned to the valuation of

* ‘Thoughts on the Grand Jury System,’ by Stephen Edward de Vere.

† In the case of *Petty Juries* some of the consequences resulting from too low a standard in the selection of jurors have been occasionally oddly illustrated. Not long since in a western county (but under legal provisions which have since been improved) a petty juror was heard to exclaim on going out of the box, ‘Thank Heaven, I won’t have to borrow a pair of shoes for the next three years!’ About the same time a man was tried for an ‘agrarian outrage:’ the pistol he had fired burst in his hand, three of his fingers had been blown off, and were produced on the trial, the prisoner standing in the dock with his arm in a sling. The evidence was conclusive, the guilt unquestionable; but popular feeling was running high, and the verdict brought in was ‘not guilty.’ The astonished and indignant judge had to pronounce accordingly. After a long silence a policeman held up the three severed fingers and demanded, ‘Pray, my lord, what am I to do with these?’ With much solemnity the judge replied, pointing to the dock, ‘Give them back to the gentleman to whom they belong!’

the barony; the number of *ex-officio* members should not exceed that of the elected members; no magistrates should sit but those having property in the barony, or area liable to the proposed taxation.'

The two local powers might be made more mutually supplemental:—

'Each item of expenditure is discussed at Baronial Sessions upon a somewhat narrow basis; the interests of a limited area are too exclusively considered. . . . It is well to have a high controlling body able and willing to take a broad, general view of the public interest of the whole county. . . . I would give to the Grand Jury a power to appoint committees for certain defined objects, such as to collect, and report upon evidence to the next Grand Jury, upon some particular, and carefully defined, question, the principle of which had not yet been adopted. . . . I stand by the Grand Jury system (with the modifications I have indicated), not only because it *works well*, but because it is founded on a true principle, and one analogous to the Constitution; and because, attached as I have been during a long life, and am, to Liberal principles, I believe in my heart, *intus et in corde*, that an upper and educated class, possessing not only a strong moral influence, but a legislative restraining power, is essential for the protection of public liberty, and especially that of the lower classes. The one thing most fatal to liberty is an uncontrolled democracy.' *

This writer asserts also that the Grand Juries should retain not only their fiscal functions, but their criminal functions also, which he designates as 'a bulwark to liberty;' while he no less insists that additional powers, and a thoroughly representative constitution, should be conferred upon the great Presentment Sessions for the county at large.

Another question now much discussed relates to the formation of an Irish Board or Boards, to facilitate the undertaking of railways and other works of a useful character, at present impeded and rendered more costly owing to the necessity of Parliamentary proceedings in such cases. Some persons have suggested the formation of joint Boards, representing the Grand Juries of each county affected by the projected improvement. We can only say that, considering the difficulty which Parliament finds in dealing with the immense mass of business thrown upon it, the creation of such local centres for the transaction of local affairs appears most desirable, whether in Ireland, England, or Scotland. Of course care should be taken that in the organisation of such in Ireland no disproportioned prominence should be given to that element in society which has shown itself so liable to be led away by extravagant proposals. So far from such a concession

* 'Thoughts on the Grand Jury System,' by S. E. de Vere.

producing 'a diversion' as regards the Home Rule cry, it would unquestionably have the opposite effect, planting the Home Rule flag over all Ireland's locally representative bodies, and thus tempting them to outstep their proper limits, and to claim an authority not theirs.

We shall not here discuss the question of the Lord-Lieutenancy and its abolition. The office is not one likely to last long; but whether the present would be an opportune time for its removal is another matter. There are those who regard it as a badge of provincialism; those again who see in it the emblem of a bygone Irish nationality; and those who regard it only in its relations with the social gaieties and commercial prosperity of Dublin. In one mode of settling the question those three parties would gladly concur. If, in quieter times than these, a Royal palace were built in the Irish metropolis, and if some member of the Royal family were to hold a court there in the Queen's name annually or at frequent intervals, all sections of society would rejoice alike—except one, that of the agitators. They know that, excitable as the Irish character is at the surface, it preserves in its depths and is ever ready to develop those instincts of loyalty which belong to an ancient and clannish race, and which have so often been exhibited, not in Ireland alone, but no less among the Celts of the Scotch Highlands and La Vendée.

In the beginning of this paper we stated our belief that in the recent vehement but very partial Irish agitation there is little cause for surprise and none for alarm. Danger could only result from it if, by creating despondency or irritation, it impeded the course of remedial legislation of which we have suggested what seems to us the wisest as well as the justest direction. It throws doubtless some difficulties in the way of such legislation: but to a statesmanship sagacious and self-possessed difficulties are often golden opportunities. The scandals which have so largely characterised the movement of the last few months are the febrile spasms of weakness, not the evidence of strength; and the acclamations of excited crowds have been bought at a heavy price, viz., the marked alienation of that support from the middle, and a portion of the higher, class which gave dignity to Mr. O'Connell's leadership. The meetings over which he presided were not disgraced by incentives to violate the law. His reply to such would have been his well-known aphorism, 'The man who commits a crime is 'the enemy of his country.' He held rule over the insurgent spirits for five-and-thirty years; in less than a tenth part of

that time Mr. Butt, in spite of his admitted talents and wide popularity, lost all control over them. A new policy arose on the ruins of his, respecting which Sir George Bowyer, in an admirable letter, remarked, 'Obstruction has certainly done 'one thing; it has made impossible any sort of Home Rule.' He proceeds:—

'The most unwise, the most inexperienced, and the most ignorant members of the Irish representation are the leaders of the so-called party of action, and they are deluding the people, and misleading them into a course which must end in rebellion and ruin. These words are strong, but they are sanctioned by his Eminence Cardinal Cullen. That eminent and venerated prelate said to me, in the most solemn manner, that the leaders of the Irish party were deceiving and deluding the people, and that the course which they were taking led to treason and rebellion. His Eminence added, "If they go on, I will denounce "them!"'

The success of an agitation reduced to such appeals is transient. When early, at an Irish election, a candidate seemed discouraged by a sudden spurt of energy on the part of a weak opponent, his conducting agent consoled him by a whisper: 'The poor man is polling his *good baronies*, and I did not 'think he would come to them so soon!' In Ireland the noisy party is not the serious party; and many a thing supposed to indicate a deep design has in reality been in a large degree but a practical joke, as when O'Donovan Rossa, then a Fenian in gaol, was returned to Parliament for Tipperary. The Ballot will, no doubt, give many such opportunities to 'light-hearted' politicians; and indeed, if a course of political education is to be regarded as needful before men are qualified to exercise the privilege of secret voting with safety to themselves and others, in spite of Shakespeare's doctrine,

'Our neighbours are our outward consciences,'

it seems hard to understand why the same period should have been deemed fit for conferring that irresponsible power, even for a trial time of eight years, alike upon the English, who have had the training of two centuries of freedom, and on the Irish, who are still in their noviciate as regards constitutional government, and who *did not demand the boon*. In the franchise and the educational system the two countries have not been thus closely identified.*

* Mr. A. M. Sullivan, himself a Home Ruler, witnesses thus to the effect of the Ballot in Ireland: 'For the first time, under the shield of 'the Ballot, a national representation freely elected by the people had 'been returned; and for the first time since the overthrow of the Irish

In the meantime the violence of Mr. Parnell and his friends has done one excellent thing: it has separated and is daily separating the steadier heads in Ireland from the emptier and more giddy, the main strength of the movement party hitherto having consisted in the fact that to distinguish between these was often most difficult, since they frequently worked together, though not with the same ends. It is for wise legislation to complete that happy severance. A legislation beneficent at once and vigorous (and it is only the friendly hand that in these times can be permanently a strong hand)—a legislation that does not value material advantages alone, that respects rooted convictions and even imaginative sympathies, but which tolerates neither outrage nor the threat of outrage—has but to persist in its way undeterred by provocations. A less dignified course would but play the game of the agitators, and save them from that ‘manifest destiny’ to which such policy as theirs hastens. Should there be any who mistake the ill-tempered course for the spirited one, or who would ‘give up Ireland as a bad job,’ because the seed-time there is not also the harvest-time, let them remember that we cannot afford to act on such a philosophy. It is precluded by the Legislative Union. If Ireland, when that great measure was passed, could justly have been regarded as irreconcilable (an opinion which we deem unfounded), in that case to keep her at arm’s length, whatever the dangers of that course, would, from the Imperial point of view, have been less dangerous, in the long run, than a legislative incorporation which only allowed her to send her representatives to a common Parliament, that, profiting by the play of antagonistic parties, and ultimately siding with the most dangerous, they might strike at the heart of the Constitution. If a country is disaffected, one of the best cures for that condition is to win its affections; and till this has been accomplished perseverance in wise legislation is imperatively required by patriotism, good sense, and duty. The Legislative Union will not fail to be completed by an entire moral union, as it has been in Scotland; and when that consummation has been reached, it will be found that Ireland has no more been

‘Parliament in 1800 a clear and strong majority of the national representation were arrayed in solemn league and covenant to restore it. *None were more astonished than the Home Rule leaders at the extent of their success.*’ (*New Ireland*, p. 385.) ‘Five years ago, however, came a measure which, as if by the flash of a magician’s wand, has changed the whole aspect of Irish politics. The Ballot has brought, for the first time, the influence, and the will, of the Irish people directly to bear on the assembly at Westminster.’ (*Ibid.* p. 393.)

'provincialised' than Scotland has been. Ireland will discover that, in becoming a great and equal part of an Empire the vastest and the most free in the world, she has found for her sons a sphere worthy of their talents and energies. England will also learn that those recollections of the past on which the Irish imagination broods, though too often appealed to for a bad purpose, are no more dangerous when the present retains no inequality, than the kindred recollections of Wallace and of Bruce; and that, if in the two national characters there are striking diversities, their contrasted qualities are often mutually supplemental. For ourselves, we do not believe that happy time need be a distant time, or that Ireland is a disaffected country because her disaffected class is noisy just now. Our recent legislation has advanced in the right direction. It is when the ship approaches the shore that the breakers sound loud. We have only to guard against running it on a rock at the harbour's mouth, and especially against a hidden rock. It is for that reason that we have alluded, though briefly, to dangers not less real, less obvious, than those which relate to the land question.

ART. V.—1. *The Miracle Play of Hasan and Husain*, collected from Oral Tradition by Colonel Sir LEWIS PELL, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., formerly serving in Persia as Secretary of Legation and Political Resident in the Persian Gulf. Revised, with Explanatory Notes, by ARTHUR N. WOLLASTON, H.M. Indian (Home) Service, Translator of the *Anwar-i-Suhaili*. In Two Volumes. (London: 1879.)

2. *Théâtre Persan*. Par ALEXANDRE CHODŹKO. Paris: Bibliothèque Orientale Elzévirienne. 1878.

3. *Les Religions et les Philosophies en Asie*. Par JOSEPH, Comte DE GOBINEAU. Paris: 1865.

‘It is the beginning of the Mohammadan year; the “sacred” month Moharram, when feasts and rejoicings and solemn services are held throughout the countries of Islam. In Cairo they are lighting up the streets where the few story-tellers that remain are reciting the old histories of Arab prowess and Bedawí love, and the Ghawází girls are distracting pious folk with their dances; and people are eating their ‘Ashúrá cakes and giving alms for the sake of “our Lord Hoseyn;” and the crowd is heaving and struggling in the great mosque of the Hasaneyn, watching the dervishes and making the circuit of the sacred tomb where lies the trunkless head of the mar-

'tyred Hoseyn. But we are in Persia, where they hold a
'different legend of this head, and have nothing to say to the
'pretensions of their Cairene rivals. Still, the Persians keep
'their Moharram after their own picturesque fashion. Long
'processions of banner-bearers and minstrels have been
'threading the streets between lines of weeping people, who
'groan and cast dust on their heads. There is a sound of
'lamentation ringing through the town, and every man is
'dressed in a sombre garb of mourning. There are no joyous
'revels, no feasts of delight; but the night is filled with the
'voices of praying men and the chant of funeral rites. As we
'push our way onward—at some risk of a mischief from the
'bands of savage fellows who parade the streets, bare-headed,
'stained with their own blood, brandishing clubs, and shout-
'ing, "O Hoseyn! O king of martyrs,"—we come to the
'great open court of a palace, whence issue dolorous cries, as
'though some horrid deed were a-doing within. We enter a
'square inclosure, tented over, and see a plain raised platform,
'whereon a few men and children stand gesticulating and
'reciting. Around are all the people of the place, crowded
'together, in dense lines from wall to platform, from the nobles
'in the shut-off boxes at the wall, to the street urchins crushed
'against the platform. Women are there, apart, seated each on
'a little bench. The men are all squatted cross-legged on the
'ground. A vast amphitheatre of faces, all bent eagerly on
'the group in the centre, and all showing the marks of grief
'and intense sympathy with what is doing there. Every
'now and then some one in the crowd lifts up his voice and
'groans aloud; then the rest take up the sound, and the whole
'place rings with cries of "Ya Hasan! Ya Hoseyn! Ay
'"Hoseyn sháh!" till the groaning and the shouts fall away
'into silence as suddenly as they arose. At last there comes
'a pause: the group in the midst have relaxed their efforts,
'the people's paroxysms of grief are hushed; young men go
'round with waterskins to moisten the dried throats; and we
'can turn and ask what this strange thing may mean.'

The answer to this question is very easy to discover. All the East knows it, and is ready to fight over it. This performance is the play of 'Hasan and Hoseyn;' it is the dramatic representation of the tragedy which has divided the whole Muslim world from the beginning till now into the two great parties of Sunnís and Shi'a, ever hostile and filled with bitter hate for each other; the tragedy of the suffering House of 'Alí, whence and in whose cause have come forward countless claimants to the Khalif's throne, rebels against the Khalif's

law; whose power has seated dynasties in Egypt and in Spain; in favour of whose descendant even the 'Abbási Khalif essayed to alter the succession-line of the vicegerents of God. The sympathy which this oppressed House has evoked from subject races, and its pliant yielding to foreign ideas, made it the parent of the strangest and the most outrageous of the doctrines which have grown fungus-like upon the mighty trunk of Islam; the mysterious doctrines of the Ismá'ílians, the apostolic succession of the Imáms, the blind devotion of the credulous Berber, the horrors of the Karmathian, the detestable Vehmgericht of the 'Assassins,' the reign of terror of the mad khalif of Egypt, and the wild apotheosis of the monster among the Druse dwellers of the Lebanon; all owe their origin to the schism of the House of 'Alí. The Shí'a have had a hand in most of the troubles of the East. Wherever they were found in subjection, there infidelity and sansculottism had a refuge. The hatred of the followers of 'Alí towards the upholders of his enemies has never slackened, neither is their love and reverence for the holy family one jot abated; and both find fuel in the moving scenes of the Passion Play of 'Hasan and Hoseyn.' They witness that play with an enthusiasm which strikes a Western beholder with amazement. The highest triumphs of the modern stage, when the actor's genius has thrown its whole power into the grandest productions of the old drama, and the artist, the historian, and the mechanician have combined to heighten the illusion by every contrivance of stage effect and minute accuracy of detail, awaken no fury of sympathy such as this simple ill-formed play produces with 'properties' and accessories so rude that they would have been scoffed at even in that plain little Globe Theatre on the Surrey side, whose bareness Shakspere covered with his art as with a king's mantle. Only in the Passion Play which Ober-Ammergau has made famous can a parallel be found to this Oriental witchery; and even there, with far greater skill and preparation, and a more artistic setting, the audience seems cold and indifferent to the Saviour's griefs by contrast with the tear-stained faces of these heart-broken Easterns, who bewail with dust-defiled head, and heaving breast, smitten with passionate hands, the martyrdom of *their* redeemer. Where else in the whole world shall we see such passion of grief, such grandeur of selfless sympathy, as here, where the people forget the passing of time and the change of place, and taking the rude platform for the real scene of the martyrdom, and the actors for those they represent, furiously stone the soldiers of Yezíd and drive them

from the stage; and the murderer-actor so loses himself in his part, that he thinks he sees the real Hoseyn in the man before him, and actually beheads him before all eyes! Such things have been known in the playing of this wonderful drama; and so commonly, that it has become difficult to find actors who will take the unpopular parts, for fear of death or at least a serious bodily mischief; and Russian prisoners, Morier tells us, have been impressed to act the murderers, who, as soon as the bloody deed was done, the martyrdom accomplished, fled from the theatre in mortal terror. Even the murderers cannot go through their parts without tears in their eyes—so deeply do the sufferings of their actor-victims touch their compunctious hearts!

The story of these ancient wrongs, this tragedy of the early days of Islam, which is so real to millions in India and Persia, seems very far away and meaningless to us, who scarcely know the names of the martyrs, and can with difficulty separate the early history of the Arabs from our recollections of the 'Thousand and One Nights.' But this tragedy is no fiction, though it has furnished the basis for a thousand wild fancies of Mohammadan devotees for many centuries. Those of us who still read our Gibbon may remember the fine passages in which the greatest of England's historians relates the wrongs of the House of 'Alí. It is an affecting story, which moves us more in its simple outline than in the mythical dress with which adoring ages have wrapped it round, and whence modern writers have drawn their imaginary ideals of the martyrs' conduct and character. Little as Eastern history has entered into the ordinary circle of reading, we have most of us heard of the lion-hearted 'Alí, the Bayard of Islam, nephew of Mohammad and adopted by him as his own son, the second convert to the new faith, and from first to last the staunchest friend and valiantest warrior that ever stood at the Prophet's right hand. It was the common report that 'Alí would succeed Mohammad as the leader of Islam, and when the Prophet died it was a surprise to the Muslims that he had not named 'Alí as the first Khalif. Without such express appointment the post was sure to be contested; and the jealousy of certain families and political parties, the seniority of other chief men, and the hatred of 'Áisha, Mohammad's favourite wife, whom 'Alí with some reason had suspected of an intrigue, combined to exclude him from the supreme power, which had not been specially intrusted to him by the Prophet, and for which his near kinship with Mohammad constituted no claim. It is a mistake into which many writers, following Shí'í legends, have fallen,

to compassionate 'Alí as the lawful Khalif deprived of his rights by usurpers. There were no rights in the case. However much a sentiment of reverence for the family of their prophet may have inclined the early Muslims to prefer them to other claimants, there was no doctrine of heredity established at the time of 'Alí. The election to the office of Khalif, or chief of the religion and the state, was vested in the whole body of the Faithful, and with certain restrictions was open to any candidate who might offer himself. The prime qualification was not near kinship to the Prophet, but the capacity to rule—the strong will, the wakeful energy, the prudence, the diplomatic skill, which could alone maintain order in the mixed and rebellious empire which Mohammad had united by his supreme influence, but which was now threatening to break up into its original divisions. The bold resolute 'Omar was undoubtedly the fitter man for this difficult position than the more shrinking and scrupulous 'Alí, and Mohammad's old friend Abú-Bekr had also, by his age and the respect in which he was held of all men, as well as by his wise, conciliating spirit, a valid title to the supreme voice. The people did well to prefer these men to 'Alí, who assuredly was not made of the stuff whereof conquering kings are fashioned. But when these were gone, and the feeble 'Othmán, the tool of the enemies of 'Alí, had met his death, there was no one so highly esteemed among the oldest supporters of Mohammad as his adopted son, and we may be sure that the fact of his being the husband of the Prophet's daughter Fátima, and the father of Hasan and Hoseyn, once the favourites of their dying grandfather, and now his sole male representatives, did not tell against 'Alí: and in 655 he became the fourth Khalif of Islam.

'Alí's reign was brief and troubled. He could not enforce his authority on the distant provinces of the momentarily increasing empire; and Mo'áwiya, the governor of Syria, and representative of a family which had always been at feud with that of Mohammad and 'Alí, openly refused to submit to his rule, and proclaimed himself Khalif in his room. Whilst still waging an unequal contest with this pretender, 'Alí was assassinated in the mosque at Kúfa, not by his enemy's orders, but by the hand of the agent of a puritan sect, who deplored the divisions of Islam and thought to heal them by the removal of 'Alí and his opponents, Mo'áwiya and 'Amr, at the same time. Unfortunately they only succeeded in murdering 'Alí, and Mo'áwiya, who had made the Khalif's five years of reign a burden to him, survived to persecute 'Alí's sons and to establish

his dynasty, which we call that of the 'Omniade' or Umawí Khalifs, firmly at Damascus.

The followers of 'Alí proclaimed his elder son, Hasan, Khalif; but this poor-spirited youth was content to sell his pretensions to the throne to his father's enemy for a handsome pension, upon which he lived at Medína in the midst of his well-stocked harím in luxurious retirement. On his death, his brother Hoseyn became the lawful Khalif in the eyes of the partisans of the House of 'Alí, who ignored the general admission of the authority of the 'Omniades,' and sought to establish a principle of hereditary succession in the line of the Prophet's daughter Fátima, 'Alí's wife. For a time Hoseyn remained quietly at Medína, leading a life of devotion, and declining to push his claims. But at length an opportunity for striking a blow at the rival House presented itself, and Hoseyn did not hesitate to avail himself of it. He was invited to join an insurrection which had broken out at Kúfa, the most mutinous and fickle of all the cities of the empire; and he set out with his family and friends, to the number of one hundred souls, and an escort of five hundred horsemen, to join the insurgents. As he drew nigh to Kúfa, he discovered that the rising had been suppressed by the 'Omniade' governor of the city, and that the country round him was hostile instead of loyal to him. And now there came out from Kúfa an army of 4,000 horse, who surrounded the little body of travellers, and cut them off alike from the city and the river. Hoseyn vainly besought his enemies to give him leave to return to the retirement he had always preferred at Medína. His entreaties were disregarded, and, seeing death lay inevitably before him, he begged his little band of followers to secure their own safety in flight: but they were men of the true Arab mettle, and, staunch to the death, stood up to the overwhelming forces arrayed against their leader. A series of single combats, in which Hoseyn and his followers displayed heroic courage, ended in the death of the Imám and the men who were with him, and the enslaving of the women and children. How desperate was the fortitude, how terrible the anguish, of the 'Family of the Tent' on this fatal field of Kerbelá, will be seen in analysing the drama which represents this tragical history.

Such is the bare outline of the misfortunes of the House of 'Alí, so far as they are touched upon in the 'Miracle Play of Hasan and Hoseyn.' The later descendants of the afflicted line endured many injuries from the orthodox Khalifs of both the 'Omniade' and 'Abbásí dynasties, and at times showed them-

selves worthy of their ancestry; but their story does not come within the scope of the play, which confines itself to the original history, with which nothing in the after history of the 'Imáms,' as 'Alí's successors were called, can compare. The bare events of this first and greatest epoch in the history of Shí'í misfortune, set plainly forth without the embellishments of religious fervour or political partisanship, do not seem to warrant the immense enthusiasm of the Persians. One may indeed fairly admire the many fine qualities of 'Alí, and deplore the butchering of his family; but to go further, and insist on the marvellous virtues of the whole household, and the indefeasible divine right of 'Alí and his descendants to the throne of Islam, is simple folly. The divine right resolves itself, as we have seen, into a popular vote; and even the virtues of the family do not bear very close inspection. The gentle 'Alí, of whom Mr. Matthew Arnold has invented a fine ideal, was certainly gentler than most of his contemporaries, but it was he who conducted the bloody capture of Khaybar; and his domestic qualities are placed in a singular light by the historians who mention his twenty-eight wives or their equivalents. His devotion to the Prophet, his uncompromising rectitude, his valour, and his indecision are the prominent characteristics of 'Alí. The rest is in the fond imagination of his biographers. As to Hasan, his son, the latest historian of Islam describes him as a voluptuary whom luxury reconciled to the loss of a crown, and in whose eyes women and wealth outweighed the ignominy of a purchased abdication. The story of his being poisoned by command of the Khalif Yezíd, son of the hated Mo'áwiya, appears to be a fable. Hasan died, like any common Muslim, in his bed, and was no martyr after all. The same authority brands Hoseyn as an adventurer who had laid himself open to the charge of perjury and high treason. It is possible to exaggerate as much on one side as the other, and Professor Dozy is perhaps as unfair to the House of 'Alí as Mr. Arnold is unduly partial. The truth seems to lie between—in the view which accords to 'Alí and his family all the merits of a worthy but persecuted line of pretenders to a throne they were ill qualified to fill, but which cannot grant them the aureoles of saints and martyrs.

Round this simple story of rival families, impotent claims, and cruel suppression has grown up a wonderful crop of fables, by which the family of 'Alí, and especially Hoseyn, have been credited with qualities almost divine. Unable to believe that their Imám was conquered and killed against his will, the Shí'a have made the whole tragedy a predestined case of

vicarious sacrifice. Hoseyn is foretold as a victim in the cause of Islam. He shall die for the sake of my people, says Mohammad of his grandson, according to these legends, and the 'Passion Play' is full of allusions to Hoseyn's redemptive work and voluntary sacrifice of his body for the sins of the Muslim world. Hoseyn himself knows, when only a child, the destiny that lies before him. 'All the rational creatures,' he says, 'men and Jinn, who inhabit the present and future worlds, are sunk in sin, and have but one Hoseyn to save them;' and when 'Alí speaks mournfully of the woes that shall happen to his family, Hoseyn answers, 'Father, there is no occasion to call these things trials, since all refer to the salvation of our sinful followers. Thou, Hasan, and I, together with my mother the virgin, will accept sufferings according to the best of our ability.' Standing by the grave of Mohammad, before departing on the fatal journey to Kerbelá, Hoseyn says, 'How can I forget thy people, since I am going to offer myself voluntarily for their sakes?' and Mohammad tells him he has taken off from his heart the burden of grief he had for the future state of mankind; and Hoseyn departs with this speech, which savours of Súfism: 'I have found behind this veil what my heart has sought after for years. Now I am made free. I have washed my hands of life. I have girded myself to do the will of God.' And so throughout the journey and on the field of battle he and all those about him are continually referring to this voluntary expiation of the sins of his people; and he dies with this thought, and in meek compliance with the will of God, and will awake at the Resurrection with the intercessory power he has purchased with his blood.

Without the introduction of this important element of self-sacrifice to idealise the character of Hoseyn, the unvarnished tale might not call forth the intense sympathy with which it is received among the Shi'a. When Hoseyn has been represented as a self-renouncing redeemer of men, and his sufferings voluntarily undergone out of love for mankind, the tragedy wears a new interest and gains a wider influence. The Persian sects have always shown a leaning towards asceticism and the renouncing of self—or what they fancied such—and this sacrifice of Hoseyn immediately appealed to their predisposition. But more than this; the story of a life surrendered for others' sake, the sad devotedness of Hoseyn, stir a feeling that exists in every heart—a certain admiration for self-denial which the most selfish men feel—a sort of worship for high ideals of conduct which has a corner in the most un-

romantic heart. It is the sorrowful resignedness, the willing yet tortured self-dedication of the martyr, that touches. One may see in it a Christian side to Islam. In the hard severity of the Arabian faith there is too little of the self-giving love which renounces all, even life itself, for the sake of others; there is more of the stiff-necked pharisaical pride which holds up its righteous head on its assured way to the pleasures of Paradise. The death of Hoseyn, as idealised by after ages, fills up this want in Islam; it is the womanly as against the masculine, the Christian as opposed to the Jewish, element that this story supplies to the religion of Mohammad.

But this idealisation of the story of the 'Family of the Tent' is not the cause but the effect of the wide-spread admiration of the Shí'a for the House of 'Alí. Men must have believed in the greatness and goodness of 'Alí and his sons, and their just title to the throne, before they came to idealise all the virtues they possessed or did not possess. There were many influences that made for the Shí'í cause, especially in Persia; and once firmly planted there, it soon found the means of widening its boundaries and spreading over a great part of the Mohammadan empire. The Persians, as a down-trodden race, instinctively sympathised with the family that had suffered at the hands of the same oppressors as themselves. How quickly this sympathy was kindled, and how widely it was felt, may be judged from the fact that the famous Khalif El-Mamún, the son of Harún er-Rashíd, and the descendant of Khalifs of unimpeachable orthodoxy, himself recognised the title of the Imáms to reign on his throne, and went so far as to appoint (though the death of the Imám annulled the appointment) the then-living representative of the family of 'Alí, the Imám Er-Rizá, to whose tomb the pious Persian still retires to die, as his successor on the throne of the Khalifs of Baghdad, and to inscribe the heretical name upon his coinage: and why?—because El-Mamún was the representative of the Persians, by whose aid he had triumphed over his brother El-Emin, and he was bound to favour the sympathies of his supporters. And once the Persians had adopted the Shí'í cause, it forthwith gained in attractiveness by their development of its mystical side. There were many mysterious properties assigned to the members of the holy family, and the Persians, with their love of the supernatural, turned them to the utmost account, and elaborated a hundred quaint fancies and curious dogmas, which considerably aided the propagation of the Shí'í heresy, and especially met with an enthusiastic reception from the credulous Berbers, from whose fostering

succour most of the great sectarian dynasties of Africa, Egypt, and Spain derived their first strength. The splendid organisation of the schismatics had no parallel in any of the other parties of Islam, and the Dá'ís, or missionaries, of the Shí'a spread the faith abroad in a propaganda which would not have discredited the Society of Jesus. Finally, the weakness of the orthodox 'Abbásí rule and the unmanageable extent of the Khalif's dominions offered a favourable field for rebellion, and as it needed a religious excuse to rouse Muslims against their spiritual chief, the schism of 'Alí's House furnished a plausible colour to all treasonable agitators, and became an invaluable peg on which to hang an insurrection. The founders of all the great dynasties that pretended to a rival spiritual power claimed a descent, real or pretended, from 'Alí and the daughter of the Prophet.

From these and like causes Shí'ism found favour in a large part of the kingdoms of Islam; and though in Africa it has lost most of its hold, Persia and a part of India remain devoted to the House of 'Alí. Instead of journeying to Mekka, the Persian pilgrims to the Meshed 'Alí, the supposed tomb of 'Alí, in the desert near Kúfa, and to the Meshed Hoseyn, 'the holy, 'blissful martyr for to scke' in his tomb amid the beautiful gold-roofed mosques and minarets and the green gardens of Kerbelá. 'In the fourth century a tomb, a temple, a city 'arose near the ruins of Kúfa. Many thousands of the Shí'a 'repose in holy ground at the foot of the vicar of God; and the 'desert is vivified by the numerous and annual visits of the 'Persians, who esteem their devotion not less meritorious than 'the pilgrimage to Mekka.' The rich pay vast sums for the privilege of being buried there, and the earth of the vicinity is sold to pilgrims at a great price, by reason of the virtue it is said to possess. No person, past or present, receives such honour and reverence in Persia as the family of 'Alí. It is possible to curse freely anything in that country or in the world outside without annoyance or hindrance—save the holy Imáms and the wife of the man you are addressing.

Every year, as the month of Moharram comes round, this devotion displays itself in a grand festival, lasting ten days, in which the history and sufferings of the holy family are commemorated, concluding with the agonising climax of the martyrdom of Hoseyn. The whole town—every town throughout the country—goes into mourning during these days, and the streets are filled with grief-stricken faces. No one seems to sleep, and the night is noisy with funeral wakes, and the solemn voices of the Seyyids Rúza-kháns, and services

are going on perpetually at the theatres, where also twice a day the melancholy drama is performed which shows the vast multitudes who resort thither the tragical history of the martyrs of Kerbelá. The theatre (*tekyá*) is a plain inclosure, built or boarded off in the court of a mosque or palace, or any other open space, or permanently attached to a rich man's house. It is sheltered from the sun and the rain by an enormous awning, stretched on masts, hung with panther and tiger skins, shields and swords, and countless lamps. In the centre is a brick platform, surrounded with a scaffolding of black poles, from which hang coloured lamps to light up the evening performances. At the back of the platform is placed the *tábút*, or model of the martyrs' tombs, which forms a very important part of the 'properties,' and in the houses of the rich, instead of the common lath and plaster and tinsel, is made of gold and silver, or ivory and ebony, elaborately inlaid.

These *tábúts* are not only found in the theatres, but are placed all over the city; rich and poor erect them; bonfires are kept constantly blazing before them, and groups of frantic men and women dance round them, and leap through the flames, to the music of castanets, and the yells of wild Berbers, who beat themselves with chains and prick their flesh with needles, in remorse for the sin of one of their race, who is reported by tradition to have mocked at the sufferings of the holy martyrs. Even the poorest keep some sort of illumination alight during this great festival, if it be only a nightlight in a jar sunk in the earth.

In front of the *tábút*, in the theatre, are placed the 'properties' of the play—Hoseyn's banner, sword and spear, and the like, and the tank which is to represent the river Euphrates; and in front is a movable pulpit. Simple as are these preparations, the theatre is often a spectacle of Oriental magnificence of the most splendid and profuse order. The performances and the decorations are generally the gift of some noble or rich man, who has a mind for popularity in this world and the next, and has no dislike to making an opportunity for the display of his jewellery and treasures, which are sometimes exhibited to the value of millions of pounds. All religious people are aware that to give a *ta'ziya*, or performance of the miracle-play, is to collect bricks for one's eternal mansion in the skies: and the costlier the bricks, the better for the soul. A specially gorgeous chamber in the wall is often prepared to assist in the representation of scenes which are meant to depict splendour, such as that where the Khalif's court at Damascus is introduced; and in this chamber royal jewels of untold value

sparkle, and the richest stuffs and embroideries of the country are used to decorate it. Round the walls of the theatre are beautifully ornamented boxes (or the windows of the over-looking houses may serve) which are quickly filled by their wealthy decorators,—else anyone might enter them, for the play is open free to all the world, except Sunnis. The whole theatre is bathed in a dazzling light, from the thousand wax candles that surround the *tábút*, and the lamps and lustres and chandeliers of coloured glass that hang in all directions from the awning and light up the beautiful porcelain vases and the paintings and the hundred treasures of art and antiquity that are spread recklessly around. We might believe that the golden prime of the good Harún er-Rashíd was come back to the world that had long mourned its departure, and that we were again walking in the magic world of Afrís and bottled Jinn, and lamps, and rings, and one-eyed Calenders, which Ja'far and his master, with black Mesrúr, invaded in their nocturnal rambles.

These theatres with their decorations are costly gifts to the people. Their preparation and embellishment, together with the pay* and entertainment of the actors, who are always royally entreated, and the constant distribution of largesses, sometimes reach no trifling total, and seven millions of francs have been expended on a single theatre during the ten days. Hardly anything can be used twice—the decorations are given to the poor at the end of the performance, except those portions which are solemnly buried on the last day. Yet so little is the cost taken into account, that a large town, like Teheran, will erect a number of *tekyas*, on every available open space; and theatres have been built so large as to gather within them twenty thousand persons.

The audience—except the blazing mass of jewellery and gorgeous apparel in the side boxes occupied by the rich and noble—are seated cross-legged on the floor, squeezing close up to the platform, so that the actors mount to it over them. And before that eager multitude, heated with the crowding and the excitement of the time—in the midst of that glare of light and

* The pay of a *jeune premier* with a good voice has been known to reach 300 tomans, or nearly 150*l.*, for the ten days of the performance: but it must be remembered that the actors generally perform half a dozen *ta'ziyehs* in one day in large towns, the same troop going from one *tekyá* to another from five o'clock in the morning to late in the evening. The men of Ispahan are preferred for the leading parts on account of their graceful dialect and their exceptional elocutionary powers.

flash of jewels and mingled glory of Eastern colour—on that plain platform, with no scenery, no accessories, a heap of straw for the plain of Kerbelá, and a copper basin for ‘the great river, ‘the river Euphrates’—without backgrounds or footlights, without a trace of mystery or illusion—a body of earnest men, and children filled with a solemn child’s awe of unknown mysteries, aided by a prompter and chorus, will act, in the soft chanting manner of the East, the story of the martyrs, the Passion Play of ‘Hasan and Hoseyn,’ till the whole multitude, actors and audience, will forget where they are and who they are, and will sway and groan and weep and shout as though the things they saw were no acting, but the real sufferings of their martyred saints.

This Drama, played in this rude fashion, yet with the skill which comes of real enthusiasm added to careful training, is a potent means of keeping alive the zeal of the Shí’a. It touches the people in their tenderest sympathies. It reminds the Persians of their own oppression under a foreign yoke, in recalling the persecution, by the same oppressors, of the martyr whose cause they identified with their own. Hoseyn was their kinsman, not only by the bond of suffering, but by the tie of marriage; for he had wedded the daughter of the last Sassanian King Yezdegird, whom Sa’d and his Arabs vanquished on the field of Kádisia. It reminds them of tragedies in their own history, before Shí’ism became the ruling faith, when the hateful Sunnís were trampling them under bloody feet. It brings to their mind cruelties which were but the legitimate continuation of the murderous work at Kerbelá. It fires them with fierce indignation against their oppressors. The softening influence of the self-sacrifice of Hoseyn, as depicted in the play, whilst it draws tears from their eyes, calls forth no answering gentleness and long-suffering in their own lives. They see not the example, but the victim to be avenged; and so real and earnest is their hate, that it fares ill with any Sunní whom they may meet in this period of excitement. The festival of Moharram is an anxious time for the Government of India.

Travellers in Persia and Indian residents have often written of this play. At the beginning of this century Morier published accounts of his two journeys through Persia, and described, though briefly and without specimens, this drama; and a native of the Deccan, Jaffur Shurreef, in his ‘Qanoon-e-Islam, or the Customs of the Moosulmans of India,’ translated in 1832 by Dr. Herklots—a work which seems to have escaped the observation of later writers—devotes considerable space to a minute description of the play and the rites of Moharram.

The Comte de Gobineau, in his 'Trois Ans en Asie,' and more fully in his 'Religions et Philosophies en Asie,' has accorded it very detailed and interesting notices, which Mr. Matthew Arnold has popularised for English readers in an essay which appeared in the 'Cornhill Magazine' and was afterwards incorporated in the new edition of 'Essays in Criticism.' Professor Dozy, in his 'Essai sur l'Histoire de l'Islamisme,' has devoted much space to a graphic description of the Moharram festival and the play. The best account, however, is to be found in Chodźko's beautiful little volume, the 'Théâtre Persan,' in which not only is the performance and the setting of the play described, but five scenes are translated at length. But no complete version or translation of this remarkable drama had appeared in any language until Sir Lewis Pelly brought out his handsome volumes. It would perhaps be more accurate to speak of the plays rather than play; for on no two occasions is the performance precisely the same; the treatment of the subject, the number of scenes, and the choice of them, vary in every instance, and the words are subject to the extemporaneous modifications of the actor as well as the changes which the anonymous playwrights, following the progress of the art of developing legends, are compelled from time to time to introduce. The scenes extracted from Count Gobineau by Mr. Arnold do not tally with the corresponding scenes in Sir Lewis Pelly's edition; and the former mentions scenes which are absolutely wanting in the latter. Chodźko, again, differs from Sir Lewis Pelly, and his manuscript of thirty-three scenes contains incidents altogether missing here. But practically the scenes are very much the same in all accounts; the difference is chiefly of words, and the absence of certain portions may be accounted for by Sir Lewis Pelly's admission that out of fifty-two scenes he omitted fifteen, with the design, as he says, of 'drawing the line somewhere even in harrowing up the feelings:' a more obvious reason is surely the shortening of an apparently endless book. The differences between the several versions are so immaterial, and the general aim and character of the play are so constant in all, that those who read Sir Lewis Pelly's 'Miracle Play of Hasan and Hosain,' may be sure they have a fair example of the drama that exercises so powerful an influence on innumerable audiences in Persia and among our Indian fellow-countrymen.

In speaking of the manner in which the work has been done, we have to do with several editors: First, Sir Lewis Pelly, who had the wisdom to turn his political residence at the Per-

sian Gulf from 1862 to 1873 to literary account by having the play taken down from the lips of a Persian theatrical teacher and prompter of actors, put into English, annotated, and published. Secondly, his assistants, Messrs. Edwards and Lucas, who translated it. Thirdly, Mr. Wollaston, who edited it and added notes. Fourthly, Dr. Birdwood, who contributed a preface. The thanks of all Orientalists—nay, of all who take an interest in the varied phases of religious sentiment—are due to Sir Lewis Pelly for his enterprising zeal in collecting the play from an authoritative oral source and having it put into an English dress. His share in the production does not extend further, but it is the chief share after all. It would be well if her Majesty's diplomatic servants more often directed their energies to the preservation of the curiosities of the people among whom they live, for which their position offers peculiar advantages. The Queen's representatives in Persia have certainly always set a good example, and the labours of Ambassadors such as Sir John Malcolm and Sir Gore Ouseley may well spur others to the same endeavours. This work of a Resident in the Persian Gulf may rank with the more learned researches of former great Englishmen in Persia, inasmuch as it perpetuates the fame of one of the most remarkable exhibitions of the great Mohammadan religion.

It is to be regretted, however, that Sir Lewis Pelly was not more fortunate in his choice of translators for the play. That there are few tasks more difficult than translation is universally admitted, and the difficulty is perhaps unusually great in translating from Oriental works. It is essential to preserve the character of the original, to keep the Eastern colouring, and at the same time to bring the work within the comprehension of persons unacquainted with Eastern ways of thought and speech: and to maintain this even balance, to produce a translation which is at once true to the character and tone of the original, and is conformable to the mental and literary demands of the West, is one of the most delicate tasks in the world. Lane's 'Thousand and One Nights' is perhaps the most perfect example of this kind of work in English, though even in his case there are critics who assert that he has allowed the balance to lean unduly to the Oriental side, and so asks too much of the reader's knowledge and patience. Professor Palmer's beautiful rendering of the Egyptian poet Beha-ed-din Zoheyr, on the other hand, inclines to the Western side and loses something of the tone of the original. All French translations fail in this direction, because the French tongue

is apparently incapable of representing any national colouring but its own.

If there were one case above all others, when the due maintenance of Eastern tone and idiom were absolutely essential to the merit of a translation, that case would be the 'Miracle Play of Hasan and Hoseyn.' The nature of the play—its bare simplicity, its imperfect cohesion, its rambling dialogue—demands vivid Eastern colour to render it at all effective to European readers. And, on the other hand, the careful preservation of a high dramatic level, a studied simplicity of style, the avoidance of all vulgarisms, and the utmost purity of diction, alone could redeem this play from tediousness and even absurdity. These two conditions, truthfulness to the original tone, and perfection of English workmanship, would seem too obvious to anyone acquainted with the literature of translations to need stating, were it not that Messrs. Edwards and Lucas appear to be wholly ignorant of any such principles. By a complete indifference to the preservation of the Oriental colour, and by employing a species of English slang, where style and poetic level can find no place, these gentlemen have succeeded in producing perhaps the worst translation we have ever seen. There is enough of the absurd in the original details of the play to make it extremely difficult at times to remember the really powerful and affecting character of the whole; and since we cannot but feel that it is a disgrace for anyone, who respects the things that deeply stir the hearts of men, to be moved to laughter at a work which contains so many of the elements of true sacredness, we are not grateful to the translators for having exerted themselves to express a religious drama in the language of a third-rate farce. Messrs. Edwards and Lucas would doubtless be competent to write the English of a German conversation-book, as the English goes in such publications, but they are eminently unfitted for any work that requires an appreciation of the delicacies of style, or a knowledge of the bare essentials of a good translation from a poetical or dramatic original. When colloquialisms like, 'With my best compliments to my father,' 'Many happy returns,' 'Be kind enough to,' are constantly occurring; when every request, even for leave to rush upon certain death, is accompanied by the word 'please,' like a demand for potatoes at a *table d'hôte*; when Hoseyn offers to give the angel 'a slight inkling into facts,' and the two 'go for a stroll,' with the object of realising this friendly proposal; when the same Imám, chiding his sister for her excessive grief at his approaching death, bids her not weep 'nor be

so very much upset,' and another sister observes at this trying moment that the martyr 'struts about gaily,' and a brother, overcome with emotion, remarks that 'heaven is rotating most singularly,' and a youth going to death takes his leave with the expression, 'I beg your pardon, and meanwhile bid you 'adieu;' and when, finally, it is confidently affirmed that at sight of the valiant deeds of Hoseyn, the Almighty himself will cry, 'Bravo!'—it is, we think, abundantly evident that the translators, whatever their knowledge of Persian may be, are wholly destitute of literary training, and are unable even to make a commonly cultured use of their mother-tongue. Their epithets are throughout ill-chosen; their phrases as a rule the most inappropriate conceivable in the circumstances; their sentences are one vast museum of curious specimens of bathos; and that peculiarity in their writing, which (as the truculent Dean of St. Patrick would say) the poverty of the English language compels us to call their style, is positively a disgrace to British education. But for the interest of its subject and the known effects of the play, the book would be unreadable.

As a specimen of the triumphs of style, we quote this passage from vol. ii. p. 87. There are hundreds as bad or worse; but this one will serve as an example. Hoseyn bids farewell to an old woman-servant, who had implored him not to leave his family and go to a certain death on the field of Kerbelá, in these words:—

'Thou hast also dandled Hoseyn most caressingly in thy arms. Thou art black-faced, that is true, but thou hast, I opine, a pure white heart, and art much esteemed by us. To-day I am about to leave thee, owing thee, at the same time, innumerable thanks for the good services thou hast performed; but I beg thy pardon for all inconsiderate actions on my part.'

It is a relief to be able to say that the general editor, Mr. Arthur Wollaston, has done his part carefully and creditably. It was, as he says, hard to edit a translation when the original text was not forthcoming; and under this disadvantage he may be congratulated on his discharge of the task. His notes and analyses of scenes are clear and to the point, and chosen either from high authorities or writers of fine descriptive powers, and it may be affirmed that, of all the obscurities and allusions in the text which might fairly puzzle an English reader, he has left scarcely one unexplained. He is commendably accurate in giving the edition-dates of the books he quotes, and even the latitude and longitude of the places mentioned in the play; and his transliteration of the original names (which we

take the liberty of changing in quotations) is unusually careful. At the same time, it must be observed that an Orientalist who piques himself, as Mr. Wollaston does, on minute literal accuracy should not have allowed such mistakes as Músab or Musáb (for Mus'ab), 'Áyishah (for 'Āishah), Táíf (for Táif), and Jinns (for Jinn, a plural word—the parallel case of Shí'ahs is excusable), to leave his hands; and he cannot be pardoned such a serious blunder as making Zeyn-el-'A'bidín into four words, Zain-ul-'Abid-dín, and contracting it into 'Abid-dín, or even familiarly 'Abid. Zeyn-el-'A'bidín means 'the ornament of the worshippers,' and 'A'bidín is a genitive plural form, and has nothing to do with *dín*, 'religion,' as Mr. Wollaston's spelling seems to infer. To call a person 'A'bidín is to speak nonsense, whilst 'Abid, being but a fragment of the last, is still more meaningless. This is a serious blunder for a scholar, but it is about the only one: the other mistakes are only trifling misspellings and the like, which, nevertheless, like the peculiar form of an American author's name, 'W. Irvine,' on p. 91, it was Mr. Wollaston's business to correct.

The editor is not to be blamed for the faults of the translation: before that matchless style the boldest man stands powerless. And he was probably equally impotent to correct Dr. Birdwood's preface. This is intended to put readers in a position to understand the drama, and it certainly furnishes in a fragmentary way a good deal of information on the origin and history of the Shí'í schism, and a graphic account of the Moharram festival and the performance of the play. But Dr. Birdwood should have had more respect for the public, whose confidence he has gained by former work, than to let the preface go out with so many unscholarlike blunders and inconsistencies and incomplete statements. Such words as Moseilmah, al Makanna, al Mohdi, Ismailians, Cadijah compared with Karijah, Amrou, Harro, and Amer son of Saed, and the like are blots on a scholar's work. The old blunder of translating Abú-Bekr (or Beker, as Dr. Birdwood has it) 'the Father of the Virgin,' i.e. of Ayesha (*sic*), is revived. The Assassins are not co-extensive with the Ismá'ílians, but are included in them. The 'Ommiyah Caliphs' (called 'Omniade' in the next page) did not reign a hundred years, but ninety-two, and the 'Abbásis began to reign either in 749 or 750, but not in both years, as Dr. Birdwood would have us believe. The writer should have made up his mind before publishing the preface whether to spell the early Shí'í dynasty 'Bouides' or 'Bouyides,' and not have written both forms within six lines. But it is needless to heap up instances of the careless manner

in which this introduction has been compiled: we can only regret that it was not submitted to Mr. Wollaston's revision with the rest of the work.

In the performance of the play there is a sort of equivalent to an overture, which varies in every case. A prologue is recited by a dervish or mullah, or in their absence by the ordinary choragus of the actors. It is thus briefly described by Dr. Birdwood, but longer addresses are recorded by Count Gobineau and Mr. Arnold:—

‘The thronging visitors at first cover the whole area of the inclosure, laughing and talking like a crowd at a fair. But in the midst of the hubbub a signal is given, it may be by the muffled beating of a drum, in slow time, the measured beats becoming fainter and more faint, until step by step the people fall back into their places, and are at length hushed in a silence which is most expressive in its dramatic effect. Then a mullah enters the pulpit, and intones a sort of “argument” or prelude to the play. He begins in some such form as this: “O ye Faithful, give ear! and open your hearts to the wrongs and sufferings of his Highness the Imám ‘Alí, the vicegerent of the Prophet, and let your eyes flow with tears, as a river, for the woes that befel their Highnesses the beloved Imáms Hasan and Hoseyn, the foremost of the bright youths of Paradise.”

‘For a while he proceeds amid the deep silence of the eager audience, but as he goes on, they will be observed to be swaying to and fro, and all together; at first almost imperceptibly, but gradually with a motion that becomes more and more marked. Suddenly a stifled sob is heard, or a cry, followed by more and more sobbing and crying, and rapidly the swaying to and fro becomes a violent agitation of the whole assembly, which rises in a mass, everyone smiting his breast with open hand, and raising the wild, rhythmical wail of *Ya Ali! Ay Hasan! Ay Hoseyn! Ay Hasan! Ay Hoseyn! Hoseyn Sháh!* As the wailing gathers force, and threatens to become ungovernable, a chorus of mourners, which has formed almost without observation on the arena, begins chanting, in regular Gregorian music, a metrical version of the story, which calls back the audience from themselves, and imperceptibly at last soothes and quiets them again. At the same time the celebrants come forward, and take up the “properties” before the *tabút*, and one represents Hoseyn, another El-‘Abbás, his brother and standard-bearer, another El-Hurr, and another Shemmar, all going through their parts (which it seems to be the duty of the chorus every now and then more fully to explain), not after the manner of actors, but of earnest men, absorbed in some high sacrament, without consciousness of themselves or of their audience.’ (xx.)

The ten days’ performances (*ta’ziyas*) ought to represent severally the events of each of the ten days of the original history; but Dr. Birdwood doubts whether this is ever strictly carried out in India. It is certain that the arrangement of the play, like the form and decoration of the theatre, and

the manner of the performance, varies greatly in different parts of the East. The first day should properly describe the departure of Hoseyn, against the entreaties of his friends, on the fatal journey to Kúfa; but it is usual to act various preliminary scenes before arriving at this point. A certain amount of suspense increases the excitement of the audience; and accordingly the actors go through some incident taken from the Old Testament or from Eastern history, or from the legends of 'Alí or of Hoseyn's youth, before they enter upon the main theme. Thus, Sir Lewis Pelly's edition presents eleven scenes (and others have probably been omitted) before that describing the departure of Hoseyn from Medína, though it must not be inferred that all these scenes were acted at a single Moharram. The prompter or manager would probably select two or three, and then proceed to the great subject of the drama.

The first scene in Sir Lewis Pelly's version represents the familiar picture of Joseph thrown into the well by his brethren. His sufferings and Jacob's anguish at the loss of his son are expiated upon only in order to enhance the impression of the still greater sufferings of the martyrs at Kerbelá presently to be set forth, and Jacob is made to admit the triviality of his woes in comparison with Hoseyn's to the angel Gabriel, who is sent to console the bereaved patriarch.

Gabriel (to Jacob). Peace be unto thee, thou wise prophet: the incomparable God, sending thee salutation, says: "What thinkest thou, O afflicted one? Is thy Joseph more precious than Mohamad's dear grandson, before whose eyes all his companions were first slain, and his own body being riddled by arrows, he was afterwards most cruelly put to death, and his corpse thrown on the ground?"

Jacob. Oh, may a thousand ones like me and my Joseph be a ransom for Hoseyn! May a thousand Josephs be the dust of his feet! May the curse of God rest on Yezíd and his party, who cruelly murdered that Imám! Come, O Gabriel! show me the plain of Kerbelá, for God's sake!

Gabriel. O Jacob, may Gabriel be a ransom for thee! May I perish for thy name, thou manifest messenger of God! Come and peep through my finger. Behold thence the land of Kerbelá.

Jacob. Declare unto me, O messenger of the glorious Lord, part of the sad transaction of Kerbelá, for thy speech has greatly grieved me; it has rendered my eyes like the river Jeyhún.

Gabriel. Alas! the tyranny of the cruel spheres! Who can hear the sad things done in Kerbelá! Injustice and oppression, hatred and enmity, shall attain to their perfection in that plain of trial as regards the descendants of God's Prophet. One shall hear no cry from that holy family but for bread and water. Their sad voices shall reach the

very throne of the Majesty on high. Their tears shall saturate all that field of battle. The children of that King of religion shall subsist on the tears alone of their own eyes.' (i. 17, 18.)

And so the scene ends. Throughout all the early part of the play, before the actual journey of Hoseyn begins, the one object is to foreshadow the great sacrifice by examples of lesser sufferings. Everyone knows already, or is told by Mohammad or by Hoseyn, the approaching tragedy of Kerbelá; and the pains of all are alleviated by the contemplation of the greater sufferings of the days to come. Everything leads up to the crowning act of Hoseyn's life. The child Ibráhím, the warrior 'Alí, the Imám Hasan, all are anxious to sacrifice their lives for the sins of the people of Islam; but it is only to point out the way to Hoseyn's greater surrender of his life for the souls of sinners, by which he alone obtained the high power of intercession with God in the Last Day. Throughout these earlier scenes, Hoseyn is the principal character, overshadowing in his splendour even the brightness of Mohammad himself. In the second scene, when Mohammad has to choose between the death of his own child Ibráhím and 'Alí's child Hoseyn, he sacrifices his own fatherly love to the happiness of the family of 'Alí, and permits Azráíl, the Angel of Death, to draw out the soul of Ibráhím. Gabriel then proposes to Mohammad that Hoseyn shall be made a propitiation for the sins of 'his beloved' people, his true family, his broken-winged birds, the people of Islam; and on the Prophet's consent Gabriel promises that on the Day of Judgment God will forgive all the sins of the people 'for the Imám's meritorious blood's sake;' and Azráíl, struck with Hoseyn's appearance, recalls a sentence from the Preserved Tablet, the great Book of God, that 'he who loves Hoseyn and mourns for him is passed from death unto life.' It is one of the most dramatic scenes in the play. The terror of the child at the approach of the Angel of Death, the soothing of Hoseyn, and the grief of Mohammad, are finely expressed.

In the third scene, Mohammad is enlightened by Gabriel as to the distribution of the various classes of sinners in the seven hells, and finds to his dismay that even Muslims may be damned, and is led to the graveyard, where he hears the cries of a disobedient son who is condemned to perpetual torture because his mother will not forgive him. His agonies in the flames are vividly described. All the bystanders are filled with compassion, and one after another the sacred family endeavour to induce the mother to forgive her son and deliver him from hell; but she continues obdurate until Hoseyn softens her heart with a description of the pains he is destined to

suffer at Kerbelá, and Gabriel threatens her with untold punishment if she does not yield to the entreaties of the holy Imám; and at last she consents to release her son from his agony. And so all the scenes bear upon the goodness and the influence of Hoseyn, and his knowledge and willing acceptance of the coming death at Kerbelá, which shall be the redemption of the sinners among the Muslims, whose damnation had so deeply moved the soul of Mohammad. In the fourth scene, 'Alí shows himself ready to sacrifice his life for the sake of his erring fellow-creatures;—it is only a finger-post to the plain of Kerbelá. In the fifth scene, the death of Mohammad, from whose dying moments the (historical) presence of 'Aïsha is studiously omitted, serves to admit the declaration of 'Alí's appointment as the first Khalif, and Mohammad's consignment of the turban, Moses' rod, Solomon's signet, and the like to this favoured disciple. The sixth directs the indignation of the Shí'a against the usurping Abú-Bekr, and the cruel 'Omar, whose endeavour to force 'Alí to recognise the former is detailed in all its fictitious violence. The death of Fátima in the seventh scene is the occasion for the display of the sacred relics of the Shí'a—the tooth which Mohammad lost at the battle of Ohod, the ring which will refresh the lips of 'Alí Akbar at Kerbelá, and the torn shirt which Hoseyn will put on when he goes to his death. Distinctions of time are boldly disregarded in the whole of this curious drama; everyone speaks of the history of the 'Family of the Tent' at Kerbelá and all that will happen to them, as though they were accomplished facts. The death of 'Alí and the poisoning of his successor the Imám Hasan, when the hated dowager, 'Aïsha, is introduced, in order to receive the full brunt of Shí'í indignation, on her refusal to allow Hasan to be interred in the sepulchre of Mohammad, bring the introductory scenes almost to a close. Two more, describing the execution by the governor of Kúfa of the envoy whom Hoseyn had sent, in order to feel the loyalty of the city, and the murder of the envoy's sons, in violation of the laws of hospitality—the children's deaths are told in an affectingly simple manner—lead us to the main theme, the journey and fighting and death of the Imám Hoseyn (scenes xii–xxiii).

On the first day of the sixty-first year of the Flight, or in October, 680 A.D., in spite of the warnings of his friends and the presentiments of his own heart, or, as the Shí'a say, in order to accomplish his known fate and work his redemptive mission, Hoseyn left Medína for Kúfa. When Zeyneb, his sister, asks Hoseyn why all this slaughter must take place

at Kerbelá, he answers, 'The helpless people of the Prophet of God have no rock of salvation to fly to for a refuge except Hoseyn. They have no advocate with God on the Day of Judgment except Hoseyn. The way of salvation is shut up against them on account of their manifold sins; and, except Hoseyn, none can make a proper atonement or propitiation for transgression. Who could save the people of God from the wrath to come, seeing the empire of faith has no other king but Hoseyn?' And so he goes like a lamb to the slaughter. Letters from Kúfa arrive, saying how the Euphrates is as restless as quicksilver in its longing for him, and the land of Kerbelá has worn out its eyes looking for his coming. The country of Kúfa is as a tulip-field, but without the rose of the face of Hoseyn it seems but thorns to its inhabitants. As Hoseyn knew beforehand how deceptive were these promises of support, and was aware he should die in that same tulip-field, the introduction of these despatches was needless. But it is noticeable that in the attempt to adhere to a certain amount of historical truth, and yet to retain the favourite traditions and fancies of the Shí'a, consistency is wholly lost sight of. The audience are too deeply moved to notice the fault, and in such a work as this it would be absurd to expect anything different.

When Hoseyn draws nigh to Kúfa, he meets with a reconnoitring party of the army that has been collected to meet him, and by the advice of the captain, El-Hurr by name, turns off the main road and arrives at Kerbelá. Here, encircled by enemies, forbidden either to advance or to retreat, the little band meets death bravely in a series of single combats. El-Hurr, who had deserted to the party of the Imám, is the first to fall, then others go out and fight and are slain, and then 'Alí Akbar, the eldest son of Hoseyn, who is determined to be the first of his family to die for the Imám.

The death of Kásim, son of Hasan, immediately after his marriage with Fátima, a daughter of his uncle Hoseyn, is one of the more striking of these preliminary encounters, and forms the subject of a special ceremony in the Moharram festival. On the seventh day this scene is acted, and the acting is not confined to the performance in the theatre. A wedding procession winds through the streets by night. The wedding presents come first, surrounded by armed men; richly dressed servants carry salvers with fruit and flowers and sweetmeats. The bridal litter follows, gorgeously embellished with silver and lighted up by a crowd of torchbearers. Musicians close the rear, and a multitude of spectators. They come to the theatre,

and with joyous shouts make the tour of the inclosure, finally placing the wedding gifts by the model of the Tombs. Hardly are the gifts deposited, when another procession appears. A long line of mourners, bearing the bier of the martyred bridegroom, surrounded by wailing people, who lead in their midst the horse of the martyr, on which are hung his turban, sword, and arrows, solemnly traverses the theatre, just as the joyous bridal party had traversed it before, and takes up its station, like the other, by the Tombs. And then the play goes on. No more powerful or effective contrast could be imagined. The thought of the bridegroom tearing himself from his bride's caresses and rushing to meet death for his saintly uncle on the wedding-day moves intense sympathy in the spectators. The peculiar improbability of a marriage in a beleaguered family hourly expecting death, the reluctance of everybody to this strange union, which the Imám abruptly declares must be arranged in accordance with some forgotten wish of his brother Hasan, are all unnoticed; the one thought is the heroic devotion of the bridegroom.

Scene after scene, we find nothing but accounts of single combats between the relations of Hoseyn and the enemy. They are all very much alike. They begin with general lamentations of the whole of the 'Family of the Tent.' Then one of them resolves to go out and fight. A heart-breaking farewell is gone through, and he departs. After abusing the enemy in melodious verse, to which the foes reply in common prose, he falls on them and produces a panic of fear. Exhausted with his exertions he returns to the tents and begs Hoseyn to give him water, for he is dying of thirst; or else he comes back to see his best-loved brother and sister once more; or perhaps he never returns. A second onslaught ends his life, and he dies with the profession of faith on his lips. The death of 'Abbás, the brother and standard-bearer of Hoseyn, is something of an exception to this common model. The sufferings of the Imám's little daughter Sukeyna impel 'Abbás to appeal to the enemy for leave to get water from the Euphrates, which lay beyond them. He urges that however treasonable Hoseyn's acts may be in the eyes of the enemy, his children at least are guiltless; and they are dying of thirst. But leave is refused, and 'Abbás returns in shame to the camp. Hoseyn consoles him in his failure, and they both resolve to go out and fight. 'It is high time,' Hoseyn says, 'both of us should swim in our own blood;' and having wrapped themselves in winding sheets, which was the gloomy

custom with these martyrs, the two take a lengthy farewell of their sisters, and ride towards the enemy.

'Hoseyn (addressing 'Abbás). Dear brother, gird thy loins, for our time is very short; turn to the field of battle and make ready for war. If this army, God forbid, should separate us the one from the other, we should never be able to see each other's faces any more.

'Abbás. I shall never separate myself from thee so long as I live; and if I die for thy sake, how fortunate would I then be! Should the enemy, however (God forbid!), make a separation between thee and me,—should they be able to remove me far away from thee,—where am I to see thy dear face, beloved brother, and how am I to be acquainted with thy circumstances in the field?

Hoseyn. If thou be separated from me by accident, go out of the field at once in the direction of the camp, and seek me there; and if I miss thee in the field, I shall try to find thee there; if I fail to discover thee, I will draw out my sword against this wicked enemy, and ask, "Where is my brother?"

'Abbás. When I am removed from thee, lay a sword on these villains, destroy the whole of them; then probably thou wilt find me. I hope, O king of religion, that in passing through the lines, thou wilt be kind enough to sit at my head and lament loudly over me.'

So they ride on till they come near the enemy, whom they harangue in the following duet:

'Hoseyn (to the enemy). O ye who are devoid of all reputation and honour—

'Abbás. Ye who have given the name of faith to infidelity—

Hoseyn. Ye who were destined to ill at your incarnation—

'Abbás. Are ye companions of God? Nay, rather ye are at enmity with his Prophet?

Hoseyn. Yezíd the tyrant is from the seed of adultery.

'Abbás. And how can one born of an adulteress deserve the Khalifat or be fit to rule?

Hoseyn. Can he be an ornament or adornment of the throne?

'Abbás. 'Alí alone and his holy children can be such as Hoseyn.

Hoseyn. O people, I am the child of the Prophet.

'Abbás. Hoseyn is lord, and I am his servant.

Hoseyn. I am the true follower of the Prophet's religion.

'Abbás. I am the heir of Haydar's high office.

Hoseyn. O ye people, far removed from morality, I am Hoseyn.

'Abbás. And I am entitled the moon of Bení Háshim.

Hoseyn. I do not care an atom (*sic*) whether I am killed.

'Abbás. Martyrdom is the heritage of my forefathers.

Hoseyn. I shall shed so much blood in the plain of enmity—

'Abbás. That the Creator of the world will say "Bravo!"

Hoseyn. O ye inhabitants of Kúfa, what are our faults?

'Abbás. Why should a stop be put to our proceedings?

Hoseyn. Do ye not know, O wicked people—

'Abbás. That of the family of the Prophet, small and great—

Hoseyn. One faints from weakness, and instantly falls to the ground—

'Abbás. Another cries out, "Thirst! Thirst!"

Hoseyn. Have ye compassion on our souls?

'Abbás. Give ye some water for our children.

Hoseyn. For the sake of Yezid, who is born of adulterer's seed—

'Abbás. How can it be lawful to be cruel to the family of God's Prophet?

Hoseyn. If ye will not intercept us in our way—

'Abbás. We will go to Turkey or Europe.

Hoseyn. But if ye will not let us escape with our lives—

'Abbás. We shall lay hold of the cutting sword.

Hoseyn. What will ye say to my mother [Fátima, daughter of the Prophet] in the Day of Judgment?

'Abbás. My judge shall be your adversary on that day.

'Omar ibn Sa'd, the general of the enemy, in reply, orders his soldiers to fall upon the brothers:—

'Ibn Sa'd. O ye soldiers of the army, ye ill-starred Syrian troops, ye brave men of the field of battle and lion-like heroes, the famous 'Abbás, the standard-bearer of the thirsty army, the defender of the oppressed! verily 'Abbás has come to the field for water; overthrow him with a volley of arrows; slay him with spears and daggers.'

They engage; the two brothers become separated:—

'Abbás (at the waters of the Euphrates). It is not right to drink water while Hoseyn, the king of religion, is parched with thirst; thou art a good servant indeed; do not, then, be so faithless.'

So he returns to the fight. The army itself reproaches its general for attacking the sons of 'Alí—Hoseyn upbraids them—and a rout takes place.

'The Army (to Ibn Sa'd). O prince of the world, the reins are gone from our hand. Mercy! mercy! Deliver us from 'Abbás, the fierce lion, and save us from the King of the age himself! Help thy army, for they are all undone; the world is darkened. Alas! alas!'

Ibn Sa'd rallies the scattered troops, and 'Abbás is severely wounded. Not seeing Hoseyn, he drags himself back to the camp, according to their agreement before the battle, and asks his sister Kulsúm if she has seen Hoseyn.

'Kulsúm. He came, dear brother, but he seemed to have lost himself; he had received many arrows in different parts of the body. He fell from time to time on the centre of the army, every now and then saying, "Where is my brother?"'

Hoseyn, who has been desperately seeking for his brother over the plain, now comes back, and learns from Kulsúm that 'Abbás, not having found him at the camp, had gone back once more to the battle. Hoseyn again follows him, and rushes among

the enemy. Shemmar tells him he has cut off the hands of 'Abbás and made him brotherless.

'Abbás. My right hand, O God, has fallen off from my body ; enable my other hand to reach the skirt of Hoseyn.

Hoseyn (still seeking for him). O land of Kerbelá, where is 'Abbás the brave ? O land of Kerbelá, where is the nightingale of my rose-garden ?

'Abbás. O hope of loving souls, come and save thy brother, who is wallowing in his own blood.

Hoseyn (at the head of 'Abbás). O brother, brother ! Now my back is broken, now my hope is lost.

'Abbás. O Hoseyn, art thou pleased with thy servant ? Art thou satisfied with his past deeds ?

Hoseyn. Oh, may I be a sacrifice for thee and these thy wounds ! I am satisfied with thee, may God be pleased with thee too !

'Abbás. Now I go, with an earnest desire, to meet the messenger of God, saying, *I testify that there is no God but the true God.*' (ii. 31-36.)

The death of 'Abbás is followed by a similar martyrdom of a certain Húshim, who volunteered in the Imám's cause. At this moment, when the enemy are pursuing Hoseyn very close, the angels obtain leave to come to his assistance ; but their aid is rejected by the martyr. He shows the angels' envoy the corpses of his dearest friends lying around him, and he says, though the crown were put on his head and the universe were subservient to him, and the Great Alexander himself were to obey his orders, and two worlds were under his control, and though Solomon were to consent to be his doorkeeper—' Verily, after ' the death of these youths, to reign would be torture. The ' crown of the king would feel like a pan of fire on my head.' So he goes on fighting. Yet so wonderful is his courage, so nimble his skill, so heavy his shock, that he still carries slaughter among the enemy, and death has not yet claimed him. (The story is here strangely interrupted by a legend of a Sultan of India threatened by a lion. Hoseyn leaves his fighting, is transported to India, addresses the Sultan at some length, the lion roaring at the two meanwhile, and then proceeds to draw tears of remorse from the penitent animal, whom he then takes back with him to Kerbelá, and shows him the bodies of the martyrs, who begin to talk in a piteous manner.) There is little now left of the fated family. The men are all dead save Hoseyn. The women gather together to carry his armour and standard. The Imám himself puts on the old torn shirt we have heard of before, and prepares for the last fight. A dervish from Kábul mysteriously appears, and throws himself upon the spears of the enemy. The king of the Jinn

comes and offers the help of troops of his genii. But Hoseyn is not tempted: 'What can I do with the empire of the world, 'or its glories, after my dear ones have all died and gone?' and he goes to meet his foes for the last time. He staggers back, wearied and hopeless, and lays his head in the dust. The enemy approach and stone him; one draws nigh to slay him. His grandfather, the great prophet Mohammad, appears to him to console him, and tells him how all this sacrifice of life tends to the happiness of the world. And Hoseyn answers: 'Seeing 'thy rest consists in my being troubled in this way, I would 'offer my soul, not once or twice, but a thousand times, for 'the salvation of thy people.' And his dead mother Fátima comes and weeps over him. And 'the accursed Shemmar' stands over him with the gleaming dagger; and Hoseyn dies with these words:—

'Hoseyn. O Lord, for the merit of me, the dear child of thy Prophet; O Lord, for the sad groaning of my miserable sister; O Lord, for the sake of young 'Abbás rolling in his blood, even that young brother of mine that was equal to my soul, I pray thee, in the Day of Judgment, forgive, O merciful Lord, the sins of my grandfather's people, and grant me, bountifully, the key of the treasure of intercession. (*Dies.*)'

There are fourteen scenes more before the play is over, but with them we shall not concern ourselves. They describe the fate of the survivors of Kerbelá, the women and children, the cruelty of their captors, various conversions of Christians by the miraculous intervention of the departed Imám, and the deaths of Zeyneb and other holy personages. The last scene represents the Resurrection. The patriarchs and prophets of the Jews arise from their sleep one after the other, and implore mercy for themselves, but show no anxiety about their flocks or the rest of the world. Mohammad is the first to inquire about the fate of his people, and to intercede for them. His intercession, and Hasan's, proving of no avail, Hoseyn comes forward at the head of the martyrs of Kerbelá, and, in the name of their woeful sufferings, prays God to have mercy on mankind. The sight of this mangled group—Hoseyn bristling with arrows, 'Alí Akbar headless, Kásim bleeding all over, 'Abbás lopped of his hands, the rope of Zeyneb, the chain of Zeyn-el-'Á'bidín, the little 'Alí Asghar with his gashed throat—prevails over the stern decrees of the Deity, and Gabriel delivers the key of Paradise to Mohammad, who in turn by Gabriel's orders delivers it to Hoseyn, with these words:—

'Mohammad. Permission has proceeded from the Judge, the gracious Creator, that I should give to thy hand this key of intercession. Go

thou and deliver from the flames everyone who has in his lifetime shed but a single tear for thee, everyone who has in any way helped thee, everyone who has performed a pilgrimage to thy shrine, or mourned for thee, and everyone who has written tragic verses for thee. Bear each and all with thee to Paradise.

Hoseyn. O my friends, be ye relieved from grief, and come along with me to the mansions of the blest. Sorrow has passed away, it is now time for joy and rest; trouble has gone by, it is the hour to be at rest and tranquillity.

The Sinners (entering Paradise). God be praised! by Hoseyn's grace we are made happy, and by his favour we are delivered from destruction. By Hoseyn's lovingkindness is our path decked with roses and flowers. We were thorns and thistles, but are now made cedars owing to his merciful intercession.' (ii. 347-8.)

And so the Play ends.—*El-Hamdu li-lláh!*

The people who have been assisting at the festival of Moharram, being dismissed with the comforting promise of Mohammad respecting all who mourn or write tragic verses for Hoseyn, now devote themselves to the great ceremony of the last day—the burial of the *tábút*—the model of the Tombs of Kerbelá. For centuries the great towns of Persia have set apart a plain outside the walls for this very purpose. It is to represent the plain of Kerbelá, and thither a mighty procession marches. Hoseyn died on the battle-field, and he must be buried as a warrior. Flags float, shots are fired, shields clashed. First come the sacred banners, then musicians chanting sad airs, next the sword-bearer, and then Hoseyn's horse, before whom walks a servant bearing the symbol of the Sun, and over whom the royal parasol is carried; Hoseyn's coat-of-mail and turban, and bow and arrows, hang from the saddle. Two censer-bearers usher on the *mullah* who will recite the funeral oration. At last come the sacred things—the funeral monuments, the litter of the bride of Kásim, and the wedding gifts. Servants mounted on elephants distribute alms on the road, and muskets are discharged all the way to the burial-ground. A vast multitude surrounds the procession, clad in mourning, barefoot, with dust on the head, and raising continually the cry of *Hasan* and *Hoseyn*. When they are come to the place, they bury the model of the Tombs with its fruits and its flowers, and the perfumes and the presents, in the vault prepared for their reception, and take themselves to their homes. And Moharram is over.

Dr. Birdwood gives a vivid description of the ceremonies of the last day at Bombay, where the tombs are carried, not to a sepulchre, but to the sea, into which indeed the very Euphrates by whose bank Hoseyn died pours its

waters. ' On the 10th of Moharram every house in which a *tábút* is kept, or in which one is put up for the occasion, sends forth its cavalcade, or company, to join the general funeral procession, which in the native Mohammadan states sometimes assumes the character of a solemn military pomp. First go the musicians, with pipes and cymbals, high horns, and deafening drums, followed by the arms and banners of Hasan and Hoseyn, and the ensigns and crests, in gold and silver, or other metals, of 'Alí and Fátima, and these by a chorus of men chanting a funeral dirge, followed in turn by Hoseyn's horse. Next come men bearing censers of burning myrrh and frankincense, and aloes wood and gum benjamin, before the *tábút* or model of the tombs of Hasan and Hoseyn, which is raised aloft on poles, or borne on an elephant. Models of the sepulchre of 'Alí also, and of Mohammad at Medína, and representations of the Seraph-Beast Burák, on which Mohammad is said to have performed his journey from Jerusalem to heaven, are also carried along with the *tábút*. There may be one or two hundred of these separate funeral companies, or cavalcades, in the general procession, which is further swollen by crowds of fakírs and clowns, or "Moharram fakírs," got up for the occasion in marvellously fantastic masquerade, figuring—one, "Jack Priest;" another, "King Tatterdemalion;" and others, "King Clout," "King Ragamuffin," "King Doubledumb," and a hundred others of the following of the "Lord of Misrule" or "Abbot of Unreason" of our Catholic forefathers. An immense concourse of people, representatives of every country and costume of Central and Southern Asia, runs along with the procession. In Bombay, after gathering its contingent from every Shí'í household as it winds its way through the tortuous streets of the native town, the living stream at length emerges on the esplanade on the side opposite Back Bay—the whole esplanade ('the Plain of "Kerbelá" for the day) from Bombay harbour to Back Bay lying almost flush with the sea. The confused uproar of its advance can be heard a mile away, and long before the procession takes definite shape through the clouds of dust and incense which move before it. It moves headlong onward in an endless line of flashing swords, blazoned suns, and waving banners, state umbrellas, thrones, and canopies, and towering above all the *tábúts*, framed of the most elegant shapes of Saracenic architecture, glittering in silver and green and gold, and rocking backwards and forwards in high air, like great ships upon the rolling sea, with the rapid movement of the hurrying crowd, beating drums, chanting hymns, and shrieking, '*Yá 'Alí, Ay Hasan, Ay Hoseyn, Hoseyn Sháh!* drowned, drowned, in blood,

'in blood; all three, fallen prostrate, dead! *Ya 'Alī, Ay Hasan, Ay Hoseyn, Hoseyn Shāh!*' until the whole welkin seems to ring and pulsate with the terrific wail. Ever and anon a band of naked men, drunk with opium or hemp, and painted like tigers or leopards, makes a rush through the ranks of the procession, leaping furiously, and brandishing their swords and spears and clubs in the air. The route, however, is strictly defined by a line of native policemen, and before these representatives of British law and order, the infuriated zealots will suddenly bring themselves in full charge to a halt, wheel round, and retreat back into the body of the procession, howling and shrieking like a flight of baffled fiends.

So, for a mile in length, the route advances, against the rays of the now declining sun, until the sea is reached, when it spreads out along the beach in a line at right angles to the "Sacred Way" by which it has come across the esplanade. Nothing can be more picturesque than the arrival and break-up of the procession in Back Bay. The temporary *tābúts* are taken out into the Bay as far as they can be carried, and abandoned to the waves, into which all the temporary adornments of the permanent *tābúts* are also thrown. This operation has a wonderfully cooling effect on the mob. Their frantic clamours suddenly cease. In fact, the mourners of Hasan and Hoseyn, having buried their *tābúts* in the sea, seize the opportunity to have a good bath; and a little after the sun has finally dropped below the western horizon, the whole of the vast multitude is seen in the vivid moonlight to be slowly and peacefully regathering itself across the wide esplanade into its homes again, and the saturnalia into which the last act of the Mystery of Hasan and Hoseyn has degenerated in India is closed for another year.¹

It is a wonderful thing, this enthusiasm of Moharram, and the most wonderful thing in it is the powerful effect of the Miracle Play. The more we read it, the more we are astounded at its influence. Making every allowance for the difference between East and West, for the faults of the translation, for the absence even of such surroundings as the play has on its simple stage, especially for the melody of the Persian language, in which the play is chanted, it is still the most intolerably tedious and dreary composition we have ever struggled through. One gets desperately weary of the perpetual wailing of women and men, the constant introduction of the merits of the inextinguishable Hoseyn, the continual single combats, and the weeping over their uniform ends, the endless recapitulation of the several injuries of the in-

dividual members of the morbid 'Family of the Tent,' the conversations with all the dead bodies. One would be thankful when each member is killed, but that he is as offensive dead as living. Any change would be grateful, but none comes. It is one long recital of woes, and one long river of tears. There is no attempt to individualise characters. They are all alike and talk alike. The only trace of originality we can find is in the child Sukeyna, who is perpetually screaming, and defying all her aunt Zeyneb's attempts at consolation. Before reading the play, one needs to be converted to the particular form of the Mohammadan religion which it immortalises. Plotless, characterless, full of iteration, of a length unbearable, the play must be judged by other than literary standards. It is in its associations, in its thousand references to the fiery memories of religious persecution, that its strength lies. That its associations should be powerful enough to overcome its dramatic defects constitutes its claim to our reverence. But that such a play should be a sacred thing in the East, and produce the frenzy of enthusiasm it does produce as surely as the month of Moharram comes round, is a new wonder added to the many strange things in the history of Islam.

ART. VI.—1. *A Description and List of the Lighthouses of the World*. Nineteenth Edition. By ALEXANDER GEORGE FINDLAY, F.R.G.S. London: 1879.

2. *Life of Robert Stevenson, Civil Engineer*. By DAVID STEVENSON, C.E. London: 1878.

3. *International Associations for the Maintenance of Sea Lights*. By Sir TRAVERS TWISS, D.C.L.

THE coasts of England, in addition to those visible perils to which we owe so much of our insular safety, are beset in many parts by hidden sources of danger, on which, in past times, many a gallant ship has been suddenly wrecked. These are the submarine rocks and outlying sands and shoals, some of which, such as the Bell Rock, near Arbroath, and the Wolf Rock, off the Land's End, have long enjoyed, if the term may be permitted, an infamous reputation. The idea of converting these fatal enemies of the mariner into welcome guides for his homeward voyage, by making them the bases of lofty and conspicuous lanterns, is of comparatively recent origin. The earliest date at which (according to Mr. Findlay's 'Description and List of the Lighthouses of the World') any of

the lights now maintained on our coasts was provided was 1636, when the North Foreland light was established. A tower 74 feet high, on the summit of St. Agnes Island, has warned the mariner from the scattered rocky group of the Scilly Isles since 1680. A red fixed light, at Hunstanton, has shone over the 'Roaring Middle Sand' since 1665. Besides these, only twenty-nine lights on the English coast date earlier than the commencement of the present century. For Scotland, which has a much longer and more dangerous, though a less frequented line of coast, it was not until 1786 that the Board of Northern Lighthouses was constituted by an Act of Parliament, which declared in its preamble that it would greatly conduce to the security of navigation and of the fisheries if four lighthouses were erected in the northern part of Great Britain. In Ireland, a white tower, 42 feet high, on the south-east point of the peninsula of Howth, displayed a light in 1671; to which a fog-horn, sounding for five seconds, at intervals of twenty seconds, has since been added. Only four other Irish lighthouses, those at Duncannon Fort, Poolbeg, Balbriggan, and Copeland, date from the eighteenth century.

The length of the coast-line of the British Islands, according to the Report of the Commission appointed in 1861 to enquire into the condition of lights, buoys, and beacons, is 9,392 nautical miles. Of these, 2,405 constitute the coast of England; 4,469 that of Scotland; and 2,518 that of Ireland. The shore-line of France, it was mentioned by way of comparison, measures considerably less than half that of Great Britain, being returned at 2,763 nautical miles. On our own shores were maintained, eighteen years ago, 357 lighthouses, besides 47 floating lights. The latter were almost confined to England, only 1 then existing in Scotland, and 5 on the Irish coasts. Including these, the English lights numbered 212, the Scottish 114, and the Irish 78. The book of 'The Lighthouses of the World' gives, for 1879, 231 English, 131 Scottish, and 97 Irish lights, making a total of 459. This shows that during the past eighteen years we have increased the number of our lights by nearly 14 per cent. We have now one light for every $10\frac{1}{2}$ miles of English, for every $34\frac{1}{4}$ miles of Scottish, and for every 26 miles of Irish coast.

The erection of a tower on a commanding promontory, and the display and maintenance of a brilliant light, are precautions to the origination of which we have no pretensions to make any claim. The whole family of lighthouses take their name from the Pharos of Alexandria, which is described by Josephus and other authors as a magnificent storied building, reared in

the time of the Ptolemies, and containing a light which was visible at sea at a distance of 300 stadia. The account given in the 'Jewish Antiquities' of the harbour-works erected by Herod the Great at Cæsarea describes lofty towers, solid for the lower half of their height, and chambered above, which by their stately height of 200 feet exceed the noblest works of the modern builder. In one respect, indeed, has the England, or rather the Scotland, of the nineteenth century out-topped the work of 'Herod of Jewry' in loftiness of structure. Characteristically enough, the building in question is neither fort nor palace, monument nor pharos. It is the chimney at the Port Dundee works, near Glasgow; which measures 468 feet from its foundation, the lower diameter being 32 feet, and the top diameter 12 feet 8 inches. The internal bore gradually contracts from the diameter of 20 feet to that of 10 feet 4 inches.

Among the loftiest lighthouses in the world is that at Callao, where, on the north point of Lorenzo Island, is an octagonal white tower, 60 feet high, the focal plane of the lantern of which is at a height of 980 feet above high water. This light, however, is said to be visible only at a distance of 12 miles. On Deal Island, in Australia (latitude $39^{\circ} 29' S.$, longitude $147^{\circ} 21' 6'' E.$), on a tower 46 feet high, is a revolving bright light, 950 feet above the sea. This is often hidden by fogs, but in clear weather is visible at a distance of 36 miles. An equal range of visibility is claimed for the light exhibited on a white stone tower, 30 feet high, on the Cape of Good Hope. The light is 816 feet above the sea, and is visible all round seaward, except when hidden by Vasco de Gama Peak. Roque Bermejo Point, in the Canary Islands, has a flashing light visible at 35 miles' distance, the height above the sea being 810 feet. But the light on the Gran Canaria Island, on the north-east part of Isleta peninsula, though 7 feet higher, is sighted for only 20 miles. Belle Isle, Newfoundland, shows a fixed bright light at an altitude of 470 feet, which is visible for 28 miles. Monte Video lights, one fixed and one flashing, at a height of 486 feet, are seen at 28 miles' distance; and the same range is ascribed to the revolving bright light on Cape Frio, in South America, at 322 feet above the sea. In the Mediterranean, on Giglio Island, is a revolving light at the height of 1,017 feet. This is the loftiest that we have found recorded, but it is said to be visible for only 26 miles. The light on Monte della Guardia, at the south end of the island of Ponza, is visible for an equal distance, although fixed at a level lower than the Giglio light by 276 feet. The

light on Cape Palinuro, dear to the student of Virgil (the guide from Naples to the Straits of Messina), is 675 feet above the sea, and is seen for 25 miles.

It is thus evident that the great range which Josephus and other authors have claimed for the famous Pharos at Alexandria must be taken with some hesitation. Mr. Alan Stevenson, a member of a family of lighthouse-builders, and the successor of his father, Robert Stevenson, as engineer to the Board of Northern Lighthouses, remarks, as to the statement of Josephus above cited, that such a range (which he makes equal to a distance of about 34 English miles) for a lighthouse on the low shores of Egypt would require a tower of 550 feet in height. This would considerably out-top the Great Pyramid, of which the present height of 485 feet is only 17 feet more than that of the Glasgow chimney. But the side of the base of the pyramid is more than half as much again as its height. It must be remembered, however, that there is this enormous difference between a chimney and a lighthouse. The former, if exposed to the fury of a hurricane blowing at the rate of 100 miles per hour, would have to withstand a pressure of 62 lbs. on every square foot of the area exposed to the blast. The latter, if a sea tower, has to resist the shock of the waves. What that may be we learn from the fact that Mr. Thomas Stevenson's marine dynamometer has registered the force exerted by the sea off the Scottish coasts, in a winter tempest, at 6,000 lbs. pressure per square foot, or nearly one hundred times the force of the hurricane.

In a little work of much interest, called a 'Rudimentary Treatise on the History, Construction, and Illumination of Lighthouses,' published in 1850, Mr. Alan Stevenson quotes from Strabo an account of a magnificent stone lighthouse at Cápío, near the harbour of Menestheus, the modern Puerta di Santa Maria, built on a rock nearly surrounded by the sea, at the mouth of the Guadalquivir. Nearly the same description is applied to this lighthouse as to the Pharos of Alexandria. The tower of Corunna is another example of the work of the ancient lighthouse builders, which is identified by Mr. Stevenson with a tower built by Caius Sævius Lupus, an architect of the city of Aqua Flavia, the modern Chaves, as mentioned by Humboldt. A lighthouse has recently been erected on this headland, furnished with a dioptric apparatus constructed by M. Létourneau of Paris. The remains of a tower called Cæsar's Altar, at Dover; of the Tour d'Ordre at Boulogne, on the opposite coast; of a Roman pharos, near Holywell; of a similar structure at Flamborough Head; and of a lighthouse

erected in 1272 at St. Edmund's Chapel, on the coast of Norfolk; are all the additional instances collected by Mr. Stevenson of the labours of his early predecessors in his noble and perilous calling.

The earliest lighthouse of modern times that demands attention is the famous Tour de Corduan, which is erected on an extensive reef at the mouth of the river Garonne. In point of architectural design and execution it is still the finest pharos in the world. Its form, that of a succession of temples, of the different Greek orders of architecture, rising one above another, like the stories of some of Sir Christopher Wren's steeples, was probably suggested by the description of the Pharos of Alexandria. The best account given of the Tour de Corduan will be found in Bélidor's '*Architecture Hydraulique*.' The rock on which it stands was dry only at low water, when it exposed a surface of 1,000 yards in length, by about half that width. A solid cylindrical basis, 135 feet in diameter, was first built in stone on the rock. On this rose, commencing with the diameter of 50 feet, one Doric, two Ionic, one Corinthian, and one Composite story, each successively diminishing in diameter. The second Ionic member of this series was fitted up as a chapel, 31 feet in diameter, and with a dome 40 feet high, which was hidden from without by the Corinthian elevation. Above this rose the cupola, of 27 feet in height, and 21 feet in diameter, which was surrounded by a stone balustrade, and in its turn supported the lantern. Even the unimaginative official list of the '*Lighthouses of the World*' describes the Tour de Corduan as '*a handsome structure, 207 feet high, on a rock.*' The height of the lantern is 194 feet above high water. The date of the establishment is given in this authority as 1727. But this is only the real date of the destruction of the original lantern, and the substitution of an iron one by M. Botri. The building was commenced under the reign of the magnificent House of Valois, in 1684, and was completed under Henri Quatre, in 1610. The unusual magnificence of the structure was due to the importance attached to it as part of a series of works intended to connect the Atlantic and the Mediterranean by a navigable channel—an object which has been effected on a modest scale by the construction of the Languedoc Canal.

England tried her 'prentice hand on the illumination of her shores at the close of the seventeenth century. Between 1696 and 1698 Mr. Winstanley designed and built, on the treacherous Eddystone rock, off Plymouth, a timber structure which supported a lantern, at what was then regarded as the lofty height of 60 feet above high-water level. The gneiss rock

which was thus illuminated formed one of the most fatal dangers of that part of the seas. It rises from a great depth with an abrupt scarp, and though its summit is barely covered by the level of the sea at high water, it is beaten by an almost perpetual surf. Such is the effect of the rock in diverting the force of the waves sweeping in from the Atlantic, that they leaped over the lantern of Winstanley and buried it under the water. The engineer was in consequence compelled to enlarge the tower and to double its height—always a very critical kind of work to attempt. He felt confident in the strength of his building, and often expressed his wish to be in it during the fiercest storm that could arise. The opportunity was afforded him in 1703. Some repairs were then needed, and Mr. Winstanley went with his workmen to the rock to superintend their execution. On the night of November 26 a terrific storm occurred, and when the morning dawned the lighthouse was no longer to be seen, nor were any tidings ever brought of the wreck.

Three years later the Trinity House obtained an Act of Parliament to extend their powers, and instructed Mr. John Rudyard to build a second lighthouse on the Eddystone. Considerable judgment was displayed by Rudyard in the construction of his tower, which proved able to resist the fury of the waves for forty-seven years, from 1708 to 1755, when it fell a prey to the opposite element—fire. The tower was of a conoidal form, 92 feet high to the top of the lantern, 23 feet diameter at the base, and 14 feet at the top. It was smoothly planked, so as to offer as little obstacle as possible to the surf, and built solid within with masonry for half its height, with the exception of a sort of well left in the centre for a staircase. The doorway was at a height of 20 feet above the lowest part of the tower, being reached by a winding staircase without from the rock. Three floors or systems of tie-bars crossed the well, which carried the staircase from the level of the entrance. Above the top of the masonry the tower was divided into four apartments, of successively increasing height; and the lantern was considerably narrower than the top of the tower. The whole was tied down to the rock by strong iron bars, dove-tailed into the base.

On the destruction of this building (which deserves a fairer fame than has of late attached to it) by an accidental fire, in 1755, Mr. Smeaton was called in. His original genius, by the employment of what may almost be called carpentry in stone, produced the noble tower which has been the pattern and example of the whole family of sea-girt lighthouses. The

floors of the Eddystone lighthouse, as built by Smeaton, were constructed on the arch principle, and the haunches of the arches were bound with chains to prevent them from pressing outward, to the injury of the walls. In this Mr. Smeaton followed the example of Sir Christopher Wren in the construction of the dome of St. Paul's; as in his turn Wren followed the lead of a yet greater master in the girding with a metal band of the springing of the dome of St. Peter's. The idea which Smeaton embodied in the form of his tower was that of the bole of the oak tree, with its tapering curve. More recent and more accurate investigations, of a mathematical nature, have proved what the true outline of a sea tower ought to be, and thus have done justice to the truthful instinct of Smeaton. The tower was made solid to the height of 11 feet above high-water level, and the masonry was carried 57 feet above this solid shaft.

For several years past, the safety of the Eddystone lighthouse has been a matter of anxiety and watchful care to the Corporation of Trinity House, as was mentioned in a note communicated by their Engineer, Mr. James Nicholas Douglass, to the Institution of Civil Engineers in 1878. During heavy storms from the westward, each wave that struck the shaft caused a great tremor throughout the building. The joints of the masonry have repeatedly yielded to the heavy strain imposed on them, and sea-water has been driven through them into the interior of the building. In 1818 Mr. Robert Stevenson, Engineer to the Board of Northern Lights, paid a visit to the Eddystone, during which he was enabled, owing to the fortunate occurrence of a low tide with a smooth sea, to make a careful inspection of the rock. He then reported:—

‘The rock is shaken all through, and dips at a very considerable angle, perhaps one in three, towards the south-west; and, being undermined on the north-east side for several feet, it must be confessed that it has an alarming appearance. I am not, however, of opinion that it has altered its state, perhaps, since the date of the erection of the tower. Since my last visit in 1813, I am not sensible of any change in it. On the north-east side, however, at what is called the “Gut” landing place, where the men sheltered themselves from the fire of Rudyard's lighthouse, but especially at low water of spring tides, there is a holing of the rock which penetrates at least to the base of the lighthouse. I therefore conclude that when the tide rises high, there is danger of this house being upset after a lapse of time, when the sea and the shingle have worn away the wall to a greater extent. Nothing preserves this highly important building but the hardness of the rock and the dip of the strata; but for how long a period this may remain, no one can pretend to say.’

In 1839, and again in 1865, the upper part of the structure was strengthened; strong internal ties being inserted, extending from the lantern floor downwards to the solid portion of the tower. On the last occasion it was found that the chief mischief was caused by the upward stroke of the heavy seas on the under-side of the cornice that projects below the lantern gallery, at a height of 68 feet above high-water. It is probable that Smeaton never anticipated so remarkable a deflection of wave movement by the graceful outline of his tower, or he would have given an appropriate curve to the under-side of the cornices, so as to turn the wave over on itself, or would have interposed a string-course for that purpose at a lower level. The projection of the cornice was reduced by 5 inches in 1865, and the stones fastened together with through bolts. The tower has since been maintained in a fair state of efficiency; but the gneiss rock has been so shaken by the effect of the sea strokes on the tower, that the danger foreseen by Stevenson in 1818 has become more menacing. It was in consequence decided to erect a new lighthouse, at a distance of about 127 feet from the present tower, on a part of the rock where a good foundation has been found near low-water level.

In the new tower, of which the foundation-stone has been laid by the Prince of Wales, the elevation of the focal plane of the light will be 130 feet above high water, or nearly twice the height of the lantern of Smeaton. The tendency of the curvilinear outline of the tower to aid the leap of the waves to an enormous height will be to some extent counteracted by making the elliptical section spring, not from the base of the tower, but from a built cylindrical base of granite, 44 feet in diameter, and 22 feet high. A level margin of 4 feet 3 inches wide will be left on the top of this solid cylinder of granite, from which will spring the graceful shaft of the tower, 35 feet 6 inches in diameter at the base, and 18 feet 6 inches diameter at the cornice, the top of which will be 138 feet above the rock. The lighthouse will be provided with a light of the first order, and with a fog signal of maximum intensity. The range of the light will be increased, by the additional height, from 14 to $17\frac{1}{4}$ nautical miles, so as to overlap the range of the new Electric Lights at the Lizard. On the completion of the new lighthouse it is intended to take down Smeaton's tower to the level of the top of the solid portion, which is 29 feet above high water of spring tides.

It may be mentioned as an example of the unexpected tests which the work of the lighthouse engineer may be called on to undergo, that in 1840 the strong iron sea door of the Eddy-

stone tower, which was constructed to resist the waves, and thus made to open outwards, was burst open from within, and the bolts and hinges torn away. Mr. James Walker, then President of the Institution of Civil Engineers, explained this unexampled occurrence by the conjecture that a partial vacuum had been formed for a moment without the tower, by the fall and curl of the wave, and that the force of atmospheric pressure from within, rushing to fill up the vacuum, had occasioned the disaster.

The danger to which mariners were exposed by the famous Inchcape Rock, which lies at the entrance of the Firth of Tay, are familiar to the readers of Border poetry; and the retribution that befell Sir Ralph the Rover for his wanton destruction of the Bell Buoy, fixed there by the Abbot of Aberbrothock, is a grim instance of poetic justice. The Bell Rock was the more to be dreaded from the fact that it was barely uncovered by the sea at low water. Repeated efforts were made, during the latter part of the eighteenth century, to obtain some efficient beacon for this frightful shoal; but public opinion was not fully roused, until, in December 1799, a dreadful storm from the north-east swept the Scottish coasts, in which it was ascertained that as many as seventy sail of vessels were stranded or lost, many of them with all hands. It was generally believed that a fine vessel of the Royal Navy, the 'York,' of 74 guns, had struck on the Bell Rock during this storm. She foundered, with her entire crew, not one being preserved to tell the tale; and the coast for many miles was strewn with fragments of her wreck. On this fatal catastrophe becoming known, the general outcry was, 'There must be a lighthouse erected on the Bell Rock.'

The site was carefully surveyed, in 1806, by Mr. Robert Stevenson, Engineer to the Board of Northern Lighthouses. He ascertained that a sufficient foundation for a tower existed on the northern part of the rock, but that five hours a day, during favourable weather in the summer season, was the utmost time for which men could be expected to work. It was thus necessary to prepare, fit, and number, the stones for the foundation courses on shore, so as to allow them to be set with the utmost speed when brought to the rock. Extraordinary ingenuity and skill were displayed by Mr. Stevenson in this part of his design. A floating lightship was prepared, and moored off the rock, and a wooden tower was erected, on lofty struts of timber, to serve as a barrack for the workmen. During the first season of the undertaking, which was the summer of 1807, the aggregate of the time which could be

worked on the rock, taken by snatches at low water, amounted to only thirteen and a half days of ten hours, or to twenty-seven of such intervals of five hours as Mr. Stevenson had stated as the outside that could be worked at a time. In the following year, time amounting to 220 hours was made available, and during this season the foundation was excavated in the solid rock, and filled in with fitted masonry to the level of the surrounding surface. Thus little more than a month's work was found to be possible during the first two years. In 1809 the barrack for the workmen was completed, and the masonry of the tower was raised to the height of 17 feet above high-water level. The tower was completed in the following year, and the light was first exhibited on February 1, 1811.

On one occasion Mr. Stevenson describes, in simple but graphic language, the peril to which his little company were exposed, before the erection of the barrack. The artificers had been landed on the rock by a boat, manned by eight men, which served as a tender to the 'Smeaton,' as the moored vessel was named. The wind continuing to blow hard, the boat's crew put off, to look to the riding ropes of the 'Smeaton' and to see that everything there was safe. Hardly had the boat reached the vessel, before the latter got adrift, carrying the boat with her; and both had got to a considerable distance before the state of things was observed by those who were intent on their own work on the rock. As it blew hard, there was much difficulty experienced in getting up a sail on the 'Smeaton,' in order to work her up to the buoy, and secure her afresh to her moorings. By the time that she was able to get her head round towards the rock, she had drifted three miles to leeward, with the boat astern. As both wind and tide were against her, Mr. Stevenson, on becoming aware of her position, became at the same time aware of the perilous predicament in which he and his workmen were left. It seemed impossible that the 'Smeaton' could reach the rock until long after it had been overflowed by the sea; as, owing to a particular set of the tides in that locality, the Bell Rock is completely under water before the ebb abates to the offing. With the flood, the rock would be at least 12 feet under water, to say nothing of the additional height of the waves, as the sea was then stormy. There were thirty-two persons on the rock, with only two boats, which, even in fair weather, would hold at most twenty-four sitters. But, in the sea then on, to attempt to row to the floating light would have been unsafe with more than eight rowers in a boat, so that half the number of the men left on the rock were unprovided with means of escape.

Mr. Stevenson feared that if he despatched one of these boats to the assistance of the 'Smeaton,' a panic would have ensued; the workmen insisting on taking to their own boats, leaving the men belonging to the 'Smeaton' to take their chance. A scuffle might have ensued, of which the consequences would have been most disastrous; and it was afterwards hinted to the engineer that the men, who were armed with stone-picks, had resolved to take to their own boats at all hazards.

For a considerable time the drifting of the 'Smeaton' was known only to the engineer and to the landing-master, who removed to the extreme point of the rock, and kept his eye fixed on the struggling craft. As long as the sound of the workmen's hammers and of the smith's anvil continued, the artificers remained intent on their work, unaware of what had occurred. At length the water began to rise on those who were engaged on the lower parts of the site of the beacon and lighthouse. From the rise of the sea upon the rock the forge fire was extinguished earlier than usual, and the discontinuance of the smoke allowed a distinct view to be taken from all parts of the rock. The men, who were now at the end of about three hours' work, began pretty generally to make for their boats in order to look for their jackets and stockings. When, instead of three, they found only two boats there, a dead silence fell on them all. They seemed to be mutely counting their numbers. The landing-master, fearing to be blamed for allowing the boat to leave the rock, still kept at a distance. The engineer stood on the highest point of the ridge, marking the progress of the 'Smeaton,' which was retarded by the pull of the small boat under her stern. The workmen looked steadily at Mr. Stevenson, and occasionally turned their glances towards the vessel, still far to leeward. All this passed in silence, and the melancholy solemnity of the group made an impression never to be effaced from the mind of the narrator.

Mr. Stevenson, who had been revolving in his mind what was best to be attempted, had come to the conclusion that when the water reached the higher parts of the rock all hands should strip off their upper clothing; that every unnecessary weight and incumbrance should be removed from the boats; that a specified number of men should enter each boat; and that the remainder should hang on by the gunwales, while the boats were rowed gently towards the 'Smeaton.'

But on attempting to speak, Mr. Stevenson became aware that his mouth was so parched that his tongue refused utterance. He stooped to take up a little water from one of the pools on the rock, and on lifting his head heard the cry, 'A boat, a boat!'

On looking round a large boat was seen through the haze, at no great distance, making to the rock. It proved to be the Bell Rock pilot, who had come out with letters. He had supposed, from the state of the weather, that all hands were aboard of the 'Smeaton,' until, approaching more nearly, he had observed the men on the rock. Sixteen of the artificers were then sent, in two trips, in the pilot's boat, with directions to make for the floating light. The remaining sixteen followed in the two boats belonging to the service of the rock. The passage was hard and dangerous, the wind continuing to rise. The party left the rock at nine, but did not reach the floating light till twelve, every man as thoroughly drenched as if he had been towed through the sea.

On the day following that narrow escape occurred the only hesitation on the part of the men throughout the whole course of the work to affront the dangers of the rock. Only eight out of twenty-six artificers, besides the foreman and the seamen, appeared on deck when the bell rang at five o'clock in the morning. These eight, however, secured four hours of work, the longest day which had been made in the season. The eighteen who had remained on the lightship disappeared from the deck on the return of their comrades, thoroughly ashamed of their conduct. And thus ended the only refusal to go to work that occurred during the whole progress of the undertaking.

On another occasion Mr. Stevenson was on board the lightship during a storm, in which she all but foundered; and in which, under the stroke of one unusually heavy sea, all on board gave themselves up for lost. As the tempest somewhat subsided, the break of the waves on the Bell Rock, and the height to which the spray was tossed, is described as wonderfully grand. About noon on the second day the floating light was found to be adrift. The cable had been chafed and cut, it was thought by fouling some portion of wreck. Another anchor was lowered in 20 fathom water. Had the parting of the cable occurred in the night, the floating light would inevitably have been dashed on the rock.

The daily passages of three miles from the lightship to the rock and back, the descent into the boats, the landing on the rock, the return after work was over, were all ordeals of no light description. Even when the timber barrack was erected, and the great annoyance of sea-sickness was thus saved to the landmen, anything but a sense of security was felt by those on the spot. In heavy gales the spray was thrown over the building to a height of 90 feet above the level of the sea. The waves

were seen to approach like the unfolding of a great scroll, and caused a draught of wind in their passage which was distinctly felt. On one occasion the floor of one of the galleries was burst up by the sea, and the triangular cast-iron sheer crane was broken down. This was observed from the floating light, with much alarm for the safety of the artificers. But it was utterly impossible to attempt anything for their relief until the gale took off.

Such were the perils amid which these brave, skilful, and hardy men reared on this fatal rock a stone tower of 100 feet in height, 42 feet in diameter at the base, and 15 feet in diameter at the top. The door is 30 feet from the base, to which height the tower is solid throughout. Above this, the thickness of the exterior walls gradually diminishes, and six apartments, including the light room, are formed. The light is given from sixteen argand lamps, fixed on a frame made to revolve by machinery, placed in the foci of parabolic reflectors, with alternate screens of red glass. It thus sheds alternately a red and a white light. The machinery which moves the lamps is also applied, in foggy weather, to toll two large bells, in order to give warning, as in the old times of the Abbot, to the mariner. The cost of this noble work was 61,330*l*. Sir Walter Scott visited the tower in 1814, and left the following *carte de visite* in the album of the lighthouse:—

‘*Pharos loquitur.*

Far in the bosom of the deep
O'er these wild shelves my watch I keep;
A ruddy gem of changeful light
Bound on the dusky brow of night;
The seaman bids my lustre hail,
And scorns to strike his timorous sail.’

In the same year in which he wrote the above lines, Sir Walter Scott, in company with the Commissioners of the Northern Lighthouses, visited the Skerryvore Rocks, which lie about 12 miles W.S.W. of the seaward point of the Isle of Tyree, almost exactly in the latitude of Iona, and 80 miles from the nearest mainland. These rocks had long been a terror to mariners. A list of wrecks that was kept for fifty years, and that was far from being complete, enumerated thirty vessels which had been lost on them within that period; and how many of those which had been reported as foundered at sea may have been wrecked on this dangerous reef there are no means of ascertaining. The reef consists of numerous rocks, stretching over an area of nearly eight miles from

W.S.W. to E.N.E. It lies in the direct track of shipping, both for the Mersey and for the Clyde. The main nucleus, which alone offered a surface sufficient to support a tower, is nearly three miles from the seaward end of the cluster. It consists of hard gneiss, worn as smooth as glass by the constant play of the water, and is so small that at high water little is visible round the base of the tower but a narrow band of a few feet in width, and some rugged rocks, separated by channels through which the sea incessantly plays. The islanders of Tyree were in the habit of making regular trips to these rocks after storms, and often returned with their boats laden with wreck. The cutting of the foundation for the tower in this irregular flinty mass occupied nearly two summers. The danger attendant on blasting the rock, where the space was so confined, and means of shelter from the flying splinters was absent, was added to those formerly experienced at the Bell Rock. The engineer entrusted with the design and execution of the Skerryvore lighthouse was Mr. Alan Stevenson, the son of the engineer of the Bell Rock lighthouse, and his successor as Engineer to the Board of Northern Lights.

The story of the erection of Skerryvore tower is almost a repetition of that of the Bell Rock. On the one hand may be set the experience which had been gained in the course of that triumphant struggle against great natural forces. On the other hand, the inaccessibility of the spot, the magnitude of the work, and even the fury of the waves, were greater in the Argyleshire seas. The granite used for the masonry was quarried in the Ross of Mull, 30 miles from the island of Tyree. Piers had to be built, both in Mull and in Tyree, for the shipment and landing of the materials. It was necessary to build a steam-tug for the service, which served in the early stages of the work as a floating barrack for the workmen. A harbour had to be formed at Hynish for the protection of the steamer. The anchorage round the rocks was bad. Two-thirds of the horizon were 'foul ground;' and the difficulty of landing on the rock was so great that it was not until 1834, when a minute survey of the reef was made, that the idea of commencing such a work was seriously entertained.

Even the question of the force and the fury of the sea is one to which science has given a definitive answer. Mr. Thomas Stevenson, another of this gallant family of engineers, constructed a marine dynamometer, which registered the force of impact of the waves. During five summer months, in 1843 and 1844, the average indications registered by means of this instrument near Tyree and Skerryvore gave 611 lbs. of pres-

sure per square foot of surface exposed to the waves. During the winter months the pressure rose, in the same locality, to more than three times that amount, or to 2,086 lbs. per square foot. At the Bell Rock the highest result obtained, by the same instrument, was 3,013 lbs. But at Skerryvore a maximum of no less than 4,335 lbs. per square foot was measured; and Mr. Alan Stevenson, in his '*Rudimentary Treatise on Lighthouses*,' where he gives the above-cited figures, adds in a note that a pressure of as much as 6,000 lbs. per square foot has since been ascertained.

A practical mark of the extraordinary fury of the Atlantic waves on the reef of Skerryvore was afforded on the night of November 3, 1838. The operations on the rock were commenced, in the summer of that year, by the erection of a wooden barrack, similar to that which had been secured on the Bell Rock. A pyramidal mass of solid timber, fastened by iron bats and bolts to the live rock, cross-braced, and strengthened by other timbers leaning inwards towards the centre, supported a strong wooden tower, containing three apartments, of which the floor was 18 feet above high-water mark. This tower was 15 feet in diameter, and 27 feet high, and was constructed with great solidity. The storm in question, which happily occurred during the season when operations were suspended, entirely destroyed and swept from the rock the framework which had been erected in the summer, leaving nothing remaining to point out its site but a few broken and twisted iron stanchions, and, attached to one of them, a piece of a beam so shaken by dashing against the rock as to resemble a bundle of laths. (The experience of the writer can confirm this statement, as regards the effect of great pressure on wood, even apart from any hammering action, such as that of the sea. After a slip in the Watford Tunnel, constructed by Mr. Robert Stephenson for the London and Birmingham Railway, which was the first great work of that description undertaken on any English railway, the fibres of the oak props were found to have been so rent from one another by the force of the pressure of the earth that they could be pulled apart like threads in a thread-paper.) After this disaster, and the completion of the roughest part of the removal of the foundation of the lighthouse, by a party that lived on the vessel for two seasons, a second attempt was made to fix a barrack, somewhat stronger than the first. This house braved the storms for several years after the works were finished, and was then taken down. Perched 40 feet above the level of the rock, in this singular watch-tower, Mr. Alan Stevenson, with thirty men, spent many a weary day and night at times when

the sea prevented any one descending to the rock; anxiously looking for a change of weather, and not always at ease as to supplies. For miles round nothing was to be seen but white foaming breakers, and nothing heard but howling winds and lashing waves.

It will be seen from these accounts, taken, as far as possible, from the very words of the chief actors in the perilous scenes described, that there is especial need for the lighthouse engineer to be characterised by those qualities which, above all others, go to make up the man. No tale of polar adventure, of subterranean struggle, or of military self-devotion, can more justly demand our sympathy as telling of a manful contest with terrific opposing forces, than these records of successful conquest from the sea, and of the conversion of the hidden dangers of our shores into the guides and safeguards of our mariners. The long period for which it is often necessary to keep up the contest must also be remembered. Mr. Alan Stevenson modestly says, in reference to the theory of lighthouse construction: 'After a residence on the Skerryvore Rock of five seasons, and eleven years' experience of its exposure, I may be allowed to speak with some confidence on the subject.' It has not always proved to be the case that man has been successful in this long struggle with the ocean and the tempest. That black and stormy night, on November 26, 1703, when Winstanley with all his assistants disappeared, together with the timber lighthouse that he had reared on the Eddystone Rock, can never be altogether forgotten by those who may find themselves surrounded by the full fury of the ocean, in a narrow and solitary tower, however firmly rooted on the rock.

The lines which bound the western and the south-eastern shores of the extreme part of Cornwall would meet, if prolonged, at a little more than eleven miles' distance from the Land's End. At this spot (in latitude $49^{\circ} 56' 41''$ N., and longitude $5^{\circ} 48' 30''$ W.) is a rock composed of hard, dark, felspathic porphyry, the highest point of which is 17 feet above low water of the spring tides, which rise 19 feet, and thus cover the rock with 2 feet of water. The surface of this rock, which is known by the name of the Wolf, is rugged, and a landing upon it is at all times difficult. The depth of the water at low tide is 20 fathoms all round, excepting on the S.E., where a shoal extends to a cable's length, having only from 4 to 5 fathoms on it at low water. The Wolf is beaten by a terrific sea, being exposed to the full force of the Atlantic Ocean. The dangerous rocks known as the Longships and the Rundle Stone lie between the Wolf and the mainland. The Seven

Stones and the Bishop Rocks, outliers of the Scilly Island group, form other members of a category of ocean dangers that beset the course of the mariner at the entrance of the English seas.

As early as the year 1823 the Admiralty contemplated the project of building a lighthouse on the Wolf Rock, and a rough plan was made by Mr. Robert Stevenson, the Engineer to the Commissioners of Northern Lights, of a stone structure for that purpose. The large amount of the estimate, which was 150,000*l.*, is supposed to have been the reason why the design was abandoned, and that of a beacon was substituted. Five years were occupied in the erection of this beacon, which was in the form of a cone of cast-iron plates, filled with a core of cement rubble, and supporting a mast bearing a ball. An average of 60 hours' work per year was all for which it was found possible for men to work on the spot, the maximum time employed being 85 hours, in 1838, and the minimum 39½ hours, in 1836. The cost of the work was 11,298*l.* The mast, which was of English oak, 12 inches in diameter, was carried away in November of the year of completion. It was replaced by a wrought-iron mast, 7½ inches in diameter, in 1842. During the succeeding winter this mast was bent about 3 feet from the perpendicular by the force of the sea; and in a storm in October 1844 it was broken off about 4 feet above the top of the cone. In July 1845 a second iron mast was fixed. The diameter was increased to 9 inches, and that of the ball was reduced from 6 feet to 4 feet. This mast stood till the early part of 1848, when it was carried away. In August 1850 a third iron mast, of 9 inches diameter, and supporting a ball of 3 feet diameter, was fixed, which withstood the force of the sea until it was taken down during the construction of the present lighthouse.

In 1860 the Corporation of the Trinity House instructed their engineer, Mr. James Walker, to furnish designs and estimates for the erection of a lighthouse on the Wolf Rock; and Mr. James Nicholas Douglass, who subsequently succeeded Mr. Walker, was entrusted with the execution of the work as resident engineer. In consideration of the exposed situation of the rock, it was determined to dovetail and face the stones both vertically and horizontally, in accordance with the system suggested by the father of Mr. Douglass, which was first adopted at the Hanois lighthouse, Guernsey. From experiments made on work of this kind, when put together with Portland cement, it is estimated that the structure is so homogeneous as to be nearly equal in strength to solid granite. The need for

taking every precaution was illustrated by the fact that thirty-four stones of the fifth course, which it was found impossible to complete during the season of 1866, were carried away by a storm in the month of November of that year.

The height of the Wolf Rock lighthouse is 116 feet 4 inches, its diameter at the base 41 feet 8 inches, and that near the top 17 feet. The work is solid, with the exception of containing a tank for fresh water, for 40 feet in height, and above this level the walls decrease in thickness from 7 feet 9½ inches to 2 feet 3 inches. The outline of the tower is formed by an elliptical curve, and 44,500 feet of granite are contained in the masonry. The light is a revolving dioptric light of the first order, showing alternate flashes of red and white at half-minute intervals, and a 5 cwt. fog-bell is fixed on the lantern-gallery, and struck by two hammers, worked by independent machinery. The first survey for determining the exact position of the proposed tower was made on July 1, 1861. The last stone was laid on July 19, 1869. During the eight working seasons comprised between these dates 266 landings were effected on the rock, and a total of 1,809½ hours' work had been secured. The light was first exhibited on January 1, 1870, and has been regularly displayed since. The total cost of the work was 62,676*l*.

In 1856 the dressed stones which were to form the granite base of a lighthouse which it was intended to erect on the Great Basses Rock off Ceylon, which lies 80 miles eastward of Point de Galle, and 6 miles from the nearest land, were landed and stored at Galle, having been prepared in England, together with the materials for erecting a cast-iron tower on the rock. The top of the rock selected as the site is 6 feet above high water, and the rise of the tide is only 3 feet. An English engineer went out as resident for the work; but after three years only a few landings on the rock had been successfully accomplished; and nothing had been effected but the erection of a beacon-mast 60 feet high, and the marking out the site for the lighthouse. The second or revised estimate for this work was 34,000*l*. By 1863, 40,000*l*. had been expended; and the estimate, which was then formed, that the sum of 20,000*l*. a year for five years would be required for the completion of the lighthouse, led to the abandonment of the works for a time. The work was afterwards put in the hands of Mr. J. N. Douglass, the Engineer to the Trinity House; and Mr. William Douglass, the resident engineer, obtained shelter for the workmen from the surf by the simple plan of building, in quick-setting cement, a brick wall 3 feet high and 2 feet

thick around the seaward side of the foundation. It can hardly be said of the erection of a lighthouse *ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte*; but the difficulties may be said to increase in a very high ratio together with the depth of the foundation below the highest point attained in the locality by the waves. In his first season Mr. Douglass secured thirty-six landings on the rock and 220 hours' work; and by the close of the third season the tower was complete in stone.

The qualities of undaunted courage, and ready power of adaptation of expedients to emergency, are not all that are required of the lighthouse builder. He must be a practical workman of the first ability; and he must also be able to grasp the scientific elements of the great problem of which his work is to form a practical solution. As to this, indeed, the scientific world owes very much to the Messrs. Stevenson for their scientific analyses, no less than for the examples set by them of successful work. No other builder has to resist the forces which assail the lighthouse. We leave out of consideration the construction of fortresses. That is a special subject. The object of the military engineer is to hold out to the last hour, being fully aware that it is only a question of time when his strongest work will succumb under a continuous fire. The lighthouse builder has not only to outlast the storm, but to do so with unimpaired and unshaken structure. He cannot afford to yield an inch. The slightest breach in his defence may, and if unrepaired in time certainly will, prove fatal. He has therefore to exercise the utmost care, both as to the materials and as to the form of his work, as well, as was before said, as to the manner of binding the materials into one compact mass.

The primary fact which renders the stability of a sea tower possible is the excess of the weight of the mass of the tower over that of the largest mass of water that can be hurled against it. In the case of a timber structure, there is no such excess of weight. The stability then depends alone on the adhesive force of the material, and on the strength with which it can be anchored to the ground. For this reason, not only timber structures, but those supported on iron tubes, have proved unfit to sustain the highest strains caused by the waves. Cast iron is nearly six times as heavy as water, and cast-iron blocks, dovetailed together, would no doubt form the most perfect base for a sea tower, unless the yet heavier substance of lead were employed in the same way. But a tower constructed of cast-iron plates, an inch thick, even if filled up with brickwork or with concrete, will not have a weight in the mass quite

double that of water. Aberdeen granite, in blocks, weighs 2·7 times its bulk of water; and limestones exist of yet superior specific gravity. The selection of the heaviest stone that can be provided, and its application in the largest and most perfectly fitted blocks, is thus the first requisite for the basis of a sea tower.

Bulk as well as weight must be proportioned to the resistance required. We have seen that the action of the sea is such, according to the opinion of competent men, as at times to form a vacuum round a lighthouse. The ordinary pressure of the atmosphere is equal to nine-tenths of a ton on the square foot; and there must be a sufficient strength in the chambered part of the tower to resist a disruptive force of that amount. As to resistance to force from without, the power of the waves has been measured at nearly three times that pressure, or at 6,000 lbs. per square foot of exposed surface. This force, however, can only be expected fully to act near the foot of the tower, or on the part where the masonry is solid. Mr. Stevenson has calculated the weight of a cylindric block of granite, 25 feet in diameter, and 10 feet high, at 380 tons. The effect of a wave on such a cylinder would be equal to that exerted on a flat surface of half the area, that is to say, on 125 square feet. This, at the maximum registered force of 6,000 lbs. per foot, would be about 335 tons. But to displace the cylinder, it must either be overturned or slid along its base. Its form, in the case supposed, would offer a resistance, equal to $2\frac{1}{2}$ times its weight, to the attempt to overturn it. And the sinking of the foundation into the solid rock would render sliding still more difficult. Thus a solid base of masonry, rising above the highest point directly assaulted by the full fury of the sea, may be the support of a chambered tower that shall give adequate accommodation for the keepers of the light.

The general proportions of a sea tower are regulated by two considerations. One is, the distance at which it is desirable that the light shall be seen. The other is, the amount of room required for stores, and for the service of the light. In the case of the Skerryvore lighthouse, the design was to exhibit a light which should be visible at a distance of eighteen miles, and which must therefore be about 150 feet above high water. The void space required for the service was taken at 13,000 cubic feet. The diameter of the hollow part of the tower was therefore calculated on that understanding.

In Smeaton's Eddystone lighthouse the radius of the base at high-water level is somewhat less than one-fifth of the height of the tower above that level. In the Bell Rock

lighthouse it is little more than one-seventh. At low water the corresponding radii would be respectively about one-fourth and one-fifth of the height. At Skerryvore, at about 4 feet above high water, a radius of 21 feet was the largest attainable on the rock. The internal diameter, above the solid part, is 12 feet; the solid part of the tower rises to 26 feet above the lowest course; and the walls above this diminish from a thickness of 9.58 feet to that of 2 feet at the top, giving an external diameter at top of 16 feet.

The question of the proper form to be given to the taper of the tower has been so thoroughly investigated by Mr. Stevenson, that he may be considered to have placed on a certain basis the rule that the outline ought to form an hyperbolic curve. As compared with a simple cone, of the same height, and the same top and bottom diameters, the economical advantage of the hyperbolic form is as much as 30 per cent. of the cost of a conical tower. The conchoidal, parabolic, and logarithmic curves were at the same time investigated by Mr. Stevenson; and their economical advantages were proved to range, in the order in which they are here mentioned, between the hyperbolic and the conical sections.

While there can be no doubt that in the case of a sea-beaten site it is the duty of the engineer to employ the heaviest and most solid stone available for the construction of a lighthouse, it must not be forgotten that under some circumstances the carriage and landing of large stones is a matter of extreme cost and difficulty, and that it may be possible to rear a framework basis, of wood or of iron, where it might not prove feasible to attempt a stone tower. Such was the case with the coral reefs of Ushruffa and the Dædalus, in the Red Sea; on which, in 1860-63, framed wrought-iron towers of great ingenuity of construction were erected by Mr. William Parkes, under the joint direction of the Board of Trade, the Egyptian Government, and the Directors of the Peninsular and Oriental Company. These structures were reared on the surface of what resembles a gigantic stone cauliflower more closely than anything else to which it can be compared. The carriage of wrought stone to the spot would have caused an excessive expense, and it was by no means certain that the reef would safely support a very ponderous structure. There was no anchorage at either reef, and as all the materials had to be conveyed in boats of light draught from the ship to the site of the tower, the several portions required to be light enough to be easily handled. It is thus evident that these lighthouses are instances of great triumphs of the engineer over special difficulties.

The ingenious invention of the screw pile, by Mr. Alexander Mitchell, was applied, in 1838, to the foundation of a lighthouse on the Maplin Sands, by Mr. Walker. Each pile consists of an iron bar, of 5 or 6 inches in diameter, on which is welded a single turn of a wrought-iron screw, of 4 feet in diameter. Such a pile can be screwed with facility to the depth of from 20 to 30 feet into a sandbank; and as each screw will bear a weight of upwards of 60 tons, a foundation, as far as resistance to weight alone is concerned, may thus be very readily secured. The shifting nature of most sandbanks, however, has to be borne in mind; and a disaster that befel a work of this kind which was attempted at the Bishop's Rock, in 1850, and another which occurred on the Minot's Ledge, Boston Bay, have deterred engineers from adopting this cheap method on exposed situations.

The late Mr. Alexander Gordon was the advocate of cast-iron towers for lighthouses. A description of one of these structures, which was erected on Gibbs' Hill, in the Bermudas, will be found in Vol. IX. of the 'Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers.' The height of that tower was 105 feet 9 inches. Its external shell was composed of 135 curved plates of cast iron, varying from 1 inch to $\frac{3}{4}$ inch in thickness, bolted together by means of flanges. The bottom of the tower, for 20 feet in height, was filled with concrete. The upper portion was divided into seven landings, or stories, independently of the lantern. Great economy is claimed for this mode of building; and, for inland towers, which are not exposed to the impact of the waves, perhaps the chief objection to its adoption arises from the perishable nature of a cast-iron plate, a substance which decays both from rust and from galvanic action, and is especially treacherous when brought into contact with lime, or mortar containing lime. The experience of the great Basses Rock is enough to show that, even as a temporary shield, an iron shell is not to be relied on for an exposed situation. And the inferior solidity of a block of cement encased in an iron shell, as compared with a solid structure of grooved, tongued, and doweled stone, is such as to put the use of the former method of building for a sea tower entirely out of the field of discussion.

While the genius and perseverance of the engineer are taxed to their utmost in the task of rearing a solid and durable tower on a rock exposed to the full fury of the stormy seas, but half of his work is done when the building is completed. Another order of phenomena has yet to be studied. Another branch of physical science has to be perfected in theory, and

reduced from theory to practice. The object of the sea-tower is to support a light, and the method of maintaining the best light, sending its beams with a full intensity in the required direction, and finally giving to the rays not only a warning, but a telegraphic power, has been the subject of the long and patient study of a number of illustrious men.

The growth of commerce, and the constant increase in the number of lighthouses on the more frequented coasts which is demanded by the increase of maritime activity, continually cause a demand for greater variety in the appearance of lights, in order to prevent disaster by the mistake of one lighthouse for another, situated at no very great distance. The lighthouse towers of the last century, though useful as points of direction by day, were most imperfect guides by night.

‘The rude expedients,’ says Mr. David Stevenson, ‘adopted at that early period to give light to the sailor in a dark and moonless sky present a very curious contrast to the modern system of lighthouse illumination—the result of careful study by modern philosophers and engineers. If proof of this be wanted, we have only to refer to the twenty-four miserable candles, unaided by reflectors or any other optical contrivances, which shed their dim and uncertain light from Smeaton’s famous Eddystone tower for nearly half a century after it was built.’

Even the protection of a glazed lantern was a novelty in the time of Smeaton. The great *Tour de Corduan* on the coast of France was lighted by blazing faggots of wood, burned in an open *chauffer*. Down to the year 1816 as much as 400 tons of coal was annually consumed on the top of a stone tower, 40 feet in height, on the isle of May. This was one of the best coal fires in the United Kingdom. Three men were employed to tend it, and there was no want of due outlay for its support. But the beacon was dependent for its efficacy on the weather, and the light was least visible when its warning ray was most urgently needed. Its appearance was ever varying, now shooting up in high flames, and then enveloped in dense volumes of smoke. In violent gales the fire only burnt on the leeward side of the *chauffer*, or iron basket, in which the coal was consumed; and the keeper was in the habit of putting his hand through the windward bars of the *chauffer* to steady himself while he supplied the fire with coals; so that in the direction in which it was most required, hardly any light was visible. Irregularity of light is a greater source of danger than the total absence of a beacon: a fact which was disastrously illustrated by the loss of H.M. ships ‘*Nymphen*’

and 'Pallas,' on December 19, 1810, on the coast of Haddington, owing to the light of a limekiln having been mistaken for the coal fire of the isle of May.

About the year 1780 Mr. Thomas Smith, a merchant and shipowner of Dundee, who was also an ingenious mechanic, directed his attention to the improvement of lighthouses, by substituting lamps provided with mirrors for the open fire. In 1786 the Chamber of Commerce, after considering a plan laid before them, resolved 'that while they allowed much ingenuity to Mr. Smith's suggestions, they were of opinion 'that a coal light should be continued.' In 1811 an apparatus invented by Mr. Robert Stevenson was introduced at the Bell Rock lighthouse, as to the excellence of which Mr. David Stevenson, with a well-becoming filial pride, cites the testimony of the Astronomer Royal, Sir W. Airy, in 1861. After having visited the lighthouses both of Britain and of France, Sir William says ('Report of the Royal Commission on 'Lighthouses,' 1861, p. 86), with regard to the parabolic reflectors in use in the lighthouse of Girdleness, in Aberdeenshire: 'I remarked in them that, by a simple construction, which I 'have not seen elsewhere, great facility is given for the withdrawal and safe return of the lamps, for adjusting the lamps, 'and for cleaning the mirrors.' He adds at the close of his report: 'It is the best lighthouse that I have seen.'

In 1811 a Commission on lighthouses was appointed in France, and at the request of M. Arago, who joined the Board in 1813, MM. Fresnel and Mathieu were associated with him in conducting the necessary researches and experiments. In September 1822, the Commission adopted a report drawn up by Admiral de Rossel, which contained a programme for the lighting of the entire seaboard of France on the system invented by Fresnel. In a paper 'On Optical 'Apparatus used in Lighthouses,' by Mr. James T. Chance, which was read at the Institution of Civil Engineers on May 7, 1867, it is stated that at that time, out of 49 sea-lights proposed in the Report, only two had been modified in their character; and the employment of metallic reflectors for sea-lights in France had been reduced to the single instance of a secondary lighthouse at Pontaillac, near the mouth of the Gironde.

The improvement, which will be ever honourably associated with the name of Augustin Fresnel, consisted in the substitution of glass refractors for metallic reflectors, or, as it is called, of the dioptric for the catoptric system. Buffon, in 1748, had proposed to form a lens à *échelons* out of a solid piece of glass,

for the purpose of a burning-glass; and Condorcet, in 1788, had improved on Buffon's idea (which had probably been suggested by the tradition of the burning mirrors employed by Archimedes) by suggesting that the burning-lens should be constructed of separate rings. Fresnel was the first to apply the lens effectively as a lighthouse instrument. His lens is plano-convex, a form probably first adopted for the sake of facility of execution, but which is also the best shape for optical reasons. The only spherical surface in the lens is that of a central disc. This is surrounded by concentric rings, of which the outer or convex surfaces are annular, the arcs being so small as to cause convergence of the light towards or divergence from the same central point, which is that in which the lamp is placed. Fresnel's first compound lens was 30 inches square, subtending an angle of 45 degrees with the focus, both vertically and horizontally, the focal distance being 36·22 inches. The lens now used in a light of the first order has the same horizontal extent, but subtends 57° vertically, so that the emerging rays form a parallel beam occupying about 47·7 per cent. of the whole luminous sphere.

For a complex dioptric apparatus of so admirable a nature a more powerful flame than any which had at that time been produced was requisite. MM. Arago and Fresnel, availing themselves of an idea of Count Rumford, succeeded in constructing a lamp on the principle of the Argand burner, but containing four concentric annular wicks, between and within which the air was admitted to feed the flame. Oil was supplied to these wicks by a pump, on the principle to which Carcel gave his name. The constant overflow of the oil, and the proper regulation of the ingress of cool air, prevent the too rapid volatilisation of the oil and the deposit of carbon on the wick. The combustion thus produced is so perfect that an equal quantity of oil produces a greater amount of light when burned in the four-wicked lamp than if it were burned in separate Argand or Carcel lamps. Thus, if the French unit of light be adopted, which is that of a Carcel lamp 20 millimètres in diameter, burning 40 grammes of colza oil per hour, it is ascertained that the four-wicked lamp will give the light of 23 Carcel lamps, with the consumption of 760 grammes of oil per hour—a quantity which would only feed 19 independent lamps; thus giving an increase of efficacy of more than 21 per cent. Thus the burner which for so many years has been successfully adopted in France is the production of the combined skill and ingenuity of a group of inventors. The idea of the multiple burner was that of Count Rumford.

To make it feasible it was necessary for Argand to contribute the double current, Lange the constriction of the glass chimney, Carcel the mechanism for the abundant supply of oil, and Arago and Fresnel the combination of these several independent improvements.

The Fresnel system was introduced into Scotland by the late Mr. Alan Stevenson, who placed the first dioptric fixed light displayed on the British coasts on the Isle of May lighthouse in 1856; the Commission of the Northern Lighthouses thus having been in advance of the Corporation of the Trinity House in introducing this valuable invention into Great Britain.

A further intensity in the useful beam of light has been produced by the combination of reflection with refraction. There is a limit beyond which the latter mode of deflecting light becomes wasteful for optical reasons. It occurred to Fresnel to employ reflecting zones above and below the refracting belt of a fixed light. Mr. Alan Stevenson, however, was the first to apply horizontal reflecting zones to a dioptric apparatus of large dimensions. He introduced them in the lower portion of the revolving light fixed at Skerryvore, where they were for the first time in use in February 1843. The apparatus was made by M. François Soleil, of Paris. In 1849 Mr. Thomas Stevenson proposed the application of reflecting prisms which should have a lenticular action, the counterpart of that of the dioptric lens. These prisms were first introduced by Messrs. Stevenson in Horsburg lighthouse, near Singapore, where the light was first thus shown to the mariner in October 1851. Those of our readers who wish for further details as to the catadioptric lights, as they are termed, as to the parabolic metallic reflectors, which are still employed in nearly half of our sea lights, or as to the azimuthal condensing system of Mr. Thomas Stevenson, will find much information on the subject in Mr. Chance's able but wholly technical paper.

It is highly instructive, as showing how necessary it is to add the most careful supervision of practical inspectors to the most perfectly executed apparatus, to add a statement made by Admiral Ryder, a member of the Royal Commission on Lights, on the occasion of the discussion of Mr. Chance's paper. The Island of Bermuda is beset by dangerous rocks. It is provided with a first-class revolving dioptric light, and it is most important that this light should do its duty thoroughly. At a considerable distance from the island the Admiral duly sighted the light. But, to his surprise, when he had anchored in the basin, at a distance of four miles from the lighthouse, no flash was visible from the deck of the 'Hero,' the line-of-

battle ship which he commanded. His eye was then about 34 feet above the level of the sea; and it was not until a height of 80 feet was reached by a midshipman, who was sent up the rigging for that purpose, that the flash was properly seen. The Admiral visited the lighthouse, and found that the keeper prided himself on the small quantity of oil which he burned. The result was the production of a paltry little flame, of not more than an inch and a half in height, the best part of which was considerably below the focus of the burner, so that the beam of light was directed upwards, and only became visible at a considerable distance. The lamp was raised $\frac{3}{8}$ ths of an inch, and the keeper directed to burn as much, instead of as little, oil as possible: and as soon as this was done a splendid flash was seen from the deck of every vessel in the basin.

We have spoken of the construction of light-towers, and of the successive improvements made in the protection and in the direction of the light. The advance made in the mode of producing the light is not less marked, and it has recently made a giant's step. Until late in the last century, as we have seen, wood or coal fires were employed for the beacons of the mariner. In 1696, tallow-candles were adopted in the first Eddystone tower, and about 1763, rude flat-wick oil lamps, combined with reflectors made of small facets of silvered glass, were employed at the Liverpool lighthouses, at the suggestion of William Hutchinson, a master mariner of that port. The cylindrical wick, admitting air to the interior of the flame, was the invention of Argand, a native of Geneva, and dates about 1780. We have seen how the simple Argand has been displaced by the concentric fourfold wick of Augustin Fresnel. Coal gas was proposed as a source of light for lighthouses in 1823 by Signor Aldini, of Milan. In 1865 it was applied to the lighthouse at Howth Bailey, in the Bay of Dublin, and subsequently to seven lighthouses on the Irish coasts. Since 1872 it has been on trial at the Haisbro' lighthouses, on the coast of Norfolk. In 1837 the invention of Mr. Goldsworthy Gurney, called the Bude Light, which is produced by the admission of oxygen gas to a flame derived from the combustion of fatty oils, was tried at the Orford lighthouse. Its intensity was found to be two and a-half times that of the lighthouse oil flame of the same dimensions, but the increased cost was such as to prevent the adoption of the plan. The Drummond, or lime, light was tried at the South Foreland lighthouse in 1862, but the results were not such as to lead the Trinity House to adopt it, in spite of its great intensity. The attempt made by Nollet to utilise the discovery made by Faraday in 1831, that a magnet could

be made to produce a current of electricity by decomposing water by means of a magneto-electric machine, in order to produce the oxygen and hydrogen required for the lime light, led to the construction by Holmes of the first magneto-electric machine of sufficient power to produce electric light of intensity adequate to the purpose of lighthouse illumination. Trials of the machine of Holmes were made under the direction of Faraday, who was scientific adviser to the Trinity House, in 1857; and on December 8, 1858 (which, by a curious coincidence, is the fête day of the great Protectress of the mariner in Roman Catholic countries), the electric light, produced by permanent magnets, was first shown on the sea from the South Foreland lighthouse. Thus was the magnet employed, not only to furnish a guide to the course of the mariner by the phenomena of polarity when carried on board ship, but also to warn him of the hidden danger of the shore by the conversion of its subtle agency into light.

The lamp or burner used by Holmes and by Faraday was designed by Dubosc, and the carbons were maintained at their proper distance by hand. In 1847 Staite invented a lamp in which the upper carbon was caused to descend towards the lower carbon, which was fixed, by a combination of electric agency and of clockwork. Serrin produced the first complete automatic lamp for alternating currents.

In 1862 a Holmes lamp was fixed on the Dungeness lighthouse, replacing eighteen sperm-oil lamps, which had been substituted for a coal fire in 1792. A small dioptric apparatus of the sixth order was provided, in place of 21-inch paraboloidal reflectors. The early experience of the light was discouraging. Frequent interruptions occurred; and the old oil lamps had occasionally to be relighted. The cost was almost exactly three times that of the old light. But if the quantity of light emitted was taken as the basis of comparison, the cost of the electric light was only 11 per cent. more than that of the oil flame.

No further steps were taken by the Trinity House for the introduction of the electric light until 1866, when favourable reports were received from the French lighthouse authorities as to the satisfactory working of the system for the two fixed lights at Cape la Hève, established respectively in 1863 and 1865. In consequence of this information, under the advice of their engineer, Mr. James Nicholas Douglass (from whose communication to the Institution of Civil Engineers in March 1879 we take the above-mentioned details), the Trinity House obtained a pair of Holmes's improved machines, with a pair of

5-horse power condensing steam-engines to drive them, as well as a dioptric apparatus for fixed lights of the third order, for a new lighthouse about to be erected on Souther Point, between Sunderland and Shields. The apparatus was sent by the Trinity House to the Paris Exhibition of 1867, and the light was exhibited every evening on a scaffolding 120 feet high, from a cylindrical lantern of 10 feet diameter. In 1870 the lighthouse was completed; and the electric light was first exhibited from it in January 1871. The cost of this light, taking equal units of quantity for comparison, proved to be only 43·6 per cent. of that formerly incurred at Dungeness. The South Foreland lighthouses were lighted by electricity in January 1872, and the Lizard lighthouses in March 1878.

In France, according to the information given to Mr. Douglass by M. E. Allard, Director-General of the Lighthouses of France, the south lighthouse of Cape la Hève was first lighted electrically in December 1863, and the northern lighthouse in September 1865. In February 1869 a flashing electric light, showing a white flash at intervals of thirty seconds, was displayed at Cape Grisnez. The five lighthouses already mentioned in this country, and three in France, are all in which the electric light has yet been established, with the exception of one at Odessa and one at Port Said. But a new electric lighthouse is in course of erection on the Isle of Planier, opposite Marseilles, which is expected to be lighted this year; and the Commissioners of French Lighthouses have decided that the Palmyre lighthouse, at the mouth of the Gironde, shall receive the electric light. M. Allard states as his opinion that this system will be extended to a great number of lighthouses on the coast of France.

If the views now advocated by Dr. Siemens and Sir W. Thomson as to the transmissibility of the electric current in large quantity be found practically available, the application of the electric light to lighthouse illumination will receive an extraordinary stimulus, as the motor power can, in that case, be exerted on the land.

The scheme proposed by the first French Lighthouse Commission, as we learn from a little pamphlet on group-flashing lights, which was published in 1875 by Dr. Hopkinson, admitted but three distinctions, viz. fixed lights, and revolving lights with flashes at the intervals of 60, or of 30, seconds. At present, the French system comprises quick-flashing lights, revolving lights with red flashes alternating with white, and fixed lights varied by flashes. Of the last there are now twenty-three on the French coasts. The requisite qualities of a good

light are thus indicated by Dr. Hopkinson. The characteristic appearance of the light must be maintained at all distances, and in all states of the weather in which it can be seen at all. The distinctions between neighbouring lights should be as simple and easy to apprehend as possible. In cases of variable lights the light must not be too long obscured; the duration of the flash should be enough to allow of taking the bearings of the light; and the successive phases should be passed through in a reasonable period of time. To this it may be added that the introduction of red light, where equally good distinction can be otherwise obtained, is objectionable on the ground of economy. The loss of illuminating power, in passing through the medium which arrests all but the red rays, is stated by Dr. Hopkinson at 63·66 per cent. If red and white flashes are combined, the portion of light devoted to each flash must be such that they shall have equal penetrating power. Thus considerable complication in arrangement is involved by the introduction of the red flash.

The final touch, so far as we have as yet advanced, to the self-distinguishing action of the lighthouse, has been put by Sir William Thomson, to whom telegraphy is already indebted for that imponderable scale beam which is formed by the refraction of a pencil of light from a slowly travelling mirror. Sir William has introduced that best form of alphabetic indication which has already superseded the more ancient types handed down to us, through the Greeks and Romans, from the Phœnicians—namely, the Morse Code. The extreme simplicity of the combination of two movements, whether of light or of sound—one short and one long—to indicate letters, is such as to approach the limit of conceivable excellency. The flashes of a lighthouse can be so combined, by the use of 30-second or of 60-second intervals, or of flashes of proportionate length of duration, as to telegraph perpetually through the darkness the initial letter of the name of the lighthouse. Thus an uninterrupted succession of short flashes would denote the letter E, the initial of the Eddystone. Three short flashes, followed by a longer interval of obscuration, would show S, for Skerryvore. A long flash, followed by three short ones, would give B, for the Bell Rock. In this mode, if more than one initial were signalled where there might otherwise be any doubt, every lighthouse in the world might be made to announce, not only its presence, but its name, to the mariner.

The object of Sir Travers Twiss, in a paper read at the Seventh Annual Conference of the Association for the Reform

and Codification of the Law of Nations, has been to advocate international conventions for the maintenance of sea lights. Scanty notices are found in writers on public law on the subject of lighthouses. Vattel, Sir Travers Twiss tells us, is silent on the subject. Azuni, writing in Italian in 1795, and G. F. von Martens, in a German treatise on the Law of Nations in 1796, deal briefly with the subject, following the views of Grotius, to the effect that it is within the right of all maritime States to require all vessels which enter their ports, or trade on their coasts, to contribute towards expenses necessary for maintaining the safety of the navigation.

The most recent indication of that common consent of civilised nations which is the foundation of public law, is afforded by the European treaty, under which Denmark has renounced her long-established practice of levying tolls upon all vessels passing through the Sound and the two Belts. The claim was a legacy of the Middle Ages. It rested on immemorial prescription, of which evidence is to be found in treatises written in the fourteenth century. It is not clear whether the origin of the practice is to be traced to the assertion of sovereign rights over the narrow passages between the North Sea and the Baltic, or whether it was regarded as a contribution towards the expense of maintaining the safety of navigation. In any case, the general treaty of Copenhagen of March 15, 1857, records the assent of the signatory Powers to the doctrine that it is the international duty of the State which controls the sea passages into the Baltic to maintain an efficient system of lighting the coasts and channels. Sweden, by a special treaty of even date, has engaged to maintain all lights necessary to facilitate the entrance into the Cattegat; and Denmark has guaranteed the vessels of the signatory Powers of the treaties of Copenhagen from any charge on that account.

The lights on the sea coasts, lake coasts, and rivers of the United States are maintained out of an annual appropriation made by Congress for that purpose. As much as thirty years ago, it appears from a correspondence between the United States Minister, Mr. Abbot Lawrence, and Viscount Palmerston, the Federal Government maintained 270 lighthouses, 30 floating lights, and 1,000 buoys, besides fixed beacons. Since that date the number of these aids to navigation has been largely increased, especially on the Pacific coasts; and no tax or rate is imposed on the vessels making use of the ports or harbours for light dues. On the other hand, Turkey has farmed to a French company its light dues, and the Egyptian Government levies light dues on vessels navigating

the Red Sea. China, since 1860, has made steady progress in the lighting of her coasts. No separate light dues are imposed; but all foreign vessels pay the same tonnage dues each time they enter a Chinese port, while coasting vessels pay them only once in three months. Japan, on the contrary, has followed the example of the United States of America, and makes no charge upon foreign vessels for lighting the intricate navigation of her coasts. A common tariff convention was entered into, on June 25, 1866, between Japan, Great Britain, France, the United States of America, and Holland, which contains an article binding Japan to light all those of her ports which are open to foreign trade. Half a million sterling has been spent by Japan in fitting up lighthouses and light-vessels, in pursuance of this treaty, during the seven years ending in 1875. The list and description of the lighthouses of the world occupies 168 closely-printed pages, with some twenty-five entries on each page.

The need of common accord between the maritime nations for lighting all points dangerous to navigation, whatever may be the sovereignty of the adjacent shores, is illustrated by this learned writer on the 'Law of Nations' by the case of the entrance to the Gulf of Aden. At present, after losing sight of the English light on the Isle of Perim, or of the English light at Aden (as the case may be), the great ocean steamers that have come through the Suez Canal, and are eastward bound, can sight no lighthouse before they see the English light on Cape Comorin, or the English lights on the southern end of Ceylon. In the highway between the two lighted points lies the dangerous island of Minicoy, one of the Laccadive group, on which one of the Peninsular and Oriental Company's steamers has already been wrecked. A light is greatly wanted on Minicoy Island; and it will be necessary that the light-tower shall have a lofty height, so as to overtop the cocoa-nut palms which are cultivated on that island. Further eastward the unlit coasts of Torres Straits and the Arafura Sea are 'dotted with dangers,' and are traversed by English, French, Dutch, and German vessels. To the need of international concurrence for this object Sir Travers Twiss very cogently refers.

That the Sultan of Morocco and Fez should have exchanged his former evil fame for causing the terrors of the Barbary coast for the credit of the discharge of the duty of lighting the entrance to the Straits of Gibraltar, is one of those remarkable incidents which accentuate the advance of civilisation in the past three hundred years. A treaty was signed at Tangier in

1865 between the Sultan of Morocco and Fez, and Great Britain, France, Austria, Belgium, Spain, the United States of North America, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Sweden. Under this treaty his Sheriffian Majesty has ordered the construction at his own expense of a lighthouse at Cape Spartel, providing a military guard for the same. The contracting Powers contribute each 60*l.* per annum for the support and administration of the light, the establishment for which is under the direction of their representatives. If by similar means a lighthouse were to be erected to the north of Galeta island, off the coast of Tunis, the Mediterranean highway to the East would be well lighted up. Sir Travers Twiss adds, in a note, the information that the French and the Tunisian Governments have concluded an agreement for the erection of a lighthouse on the island of Galeta; and that a lighthouse, for which certain dues are charged upon all vessels entering the Tunisian ports, has been erected at Cape Bon by the Bey of Tunis. A scheme for supplying further lights in the Red Sea, between the iron lighthouse on the Dædalus Shoal and the English light on the isle of Perim, is under the joint consideration of the English and the French Governments.

It seems clear that, of the three modes which have been successively introduced for the maintenance of lighthouses, the last is that to which the mariner will look forward with most confidence for the indication of danger in yet unlighted seas. The most ancient assertion of Public Law on the subject sanctioned the levying of tolls on all vessels entering the ports of a State which itself undertook the responsibility of lighting its own shores. On the coasts of the United States and of Japan, and under the British flag in the Bahama Islands, and at Cape Pembroke in the Falkland Islands, lights for which no charge is levied on the shipping are maintained by the respective Governments. The Cape Spartel Convention establishes a new point of departure. It is most desirable that the example should be so followed as to point out the dangers of the shoal water coast of Zanzibar, of the Mozambique channel, which is swept by a strong current, and of the course to the eastward of Madagascar for the islands of Réunion and of Mauritius.

While the optical and photogenic inventions which have been so successfully applied to some of the most important sea lights of France and of England, of which we have thus offered a brief notice, form a subject of the deepest interest for the scientific reader—full as the history of the past is of yet brighter promise for the future—it is the record of the manly fortitude and gallant struggles of the engineer with one of the

mightiest powers of nature that throws around the sea towers a halo of romance. The very spirit of the Sea-kings might have inspired the builders of the sea towers of Aberbrothock and of Skerryvore. Nor do the pages of fiction contain many scenes more stirring than are the simple accounts, given by more than one of a remarkable family of lighthouse builders, of the great pains and peril undergone by those who undertake the noble duty of converting the hidden rocks and shoals of our coasts into the support of the best safeguards of the mariner from the dangers of our shores.

We feel compelled to make room for a reference to a long and important letter, from Sir William Thomson, to the 'Times,' which has been published since the preceding pages were in type. Returning from a cruise of ten days on board her Majesty's ship 'Northampton' in the English Channel, Sir William writes to express the renewal of his conviction as to the need of a threefold reform in our lighthouse system. On two of these items of reform we have above spoken. We have shown the disadvantages attending on the use of coloured screens, owing to the positive loss of light incurred. To this Sir William adds the caution that some 4 per cent. of our population are affected with colour-blindness. He proposes the abolition of all coloured lights, and the full carrying out of that beautiful method of indicating the initial letter of the name of every light by the Morse system of dots and dashes with which his name will ever be indissolubly connected.

But the point on which the advice of Sir William Thomson, given in a graphic dictum which has the very flavour of the salt water in its earnestness, is chiefly now to be re-echoed, is that of the rapidity to be given to the revolution of changing lights. He recently sighted the Wolf, and had come to the conclusion that the speed of revolution was enough, when he discovered that the quickness was the result of irregularity. In fifteen periods the intervals varied from 19 to 40 seconds, or from a third less to a fourth more than the time announced in the lighthouse notices. The distinctive value of a definite period in a revolving light is almost annulled by such irregularities as these. 'Except in one unimportant case—the Dungeness low light, which flashes every five seconds—all the revolving lights of the English Channel are too slow, and it would be an unspeakable improvement if, with that exception, every one of them had its speed sextupled.' We fully concur in Sir William Thomson's statement that the seafaring world ought not to be allowed to suffer from delay in gaining a great benefit, and are glad to have the opportunity of calling attention to his advice.

ART. VII.—*Russia before and after the War.* By the author of ‘Society in St. Petersburg.’ Translated from the German by EDWARD FAIRFAX TAYLOR. 8vo. London: 1880.

THE world is full of storms and portents, and we know not in what quarter of the globe the eye can rest with confidence upon a scene of prosperity and peace; but amidst these elements of disturbance and of dread none are so astonishing as the forces which appear to be rending the fabric of the Russian Empire. There we see despotism driven to desperation by its own weapons of mystery and crime—a sovereign who, not long ago, was supposed to be venerated as a superior being by his subjects, tracked by assassins like the tyrants of old—crimes of abominable ferocity undetected and unpunished by an omnipotent police—the chief cities converted into gaols. and a whole empire under military law—wild theories of revolutionary violence, not proceeding from an ignorant populace, but permeating the more educated classes of society—a degraded clergy and a superstitious Church exercising no moral control over the people—a colossal military force not directed by adequate intelligence—a corrupt administration, intemperate reformers, and a discontented nation. Well might it be said by the provincial delegates of Tchernigoff in their address to the Emperor (although the passage was struck out by the governor of the province): ‘It is an illusion to think that anarchical ideas can be destroyed by measures of violence. These ideas live and flourish so long as they find a favourable soil, and the persons whom it is attempted to suppress are replaced by others.’ How has the state of Russia come to this pass? What will be the upshot of it? These are questions of extreme interest, not only to Russia, but to mankind. They are answered and explained to a considerable extent by the author of the volume now before us, and its appearance at the present time is an event of no common importance.

Some few years ago Mr. Mackenzie Wallace gave us an Arcadian picture of Russian village life which was received with much favour by the British public, though we took occasion to remark at the time that he appeared to us to have misconceived the true character of the Russian *mir*, which is not an institution of liberty but of despotism, and that he had omitted to notice the fundamental conditions of the Russian problem—the court, the army, the finances, and the admini-

stration. The author of the work now before us speaks with far wider sources of information and with higher authority. Himself a Russian (though, as we infer, from the Baltic provinces, and writing in German); educated at the University of St. Petersburg, and practically acquainted with the strange training of Russian youth; familiar with the society of St. Petersburg, as he has shown in a former volume, and a shrewd judge of character speaking from personal knowledge of the leading characters of the day; himself alike opposed to absolutism and to revolutionary theories, we have here the most competent witness whom we have yet had occasion to examine; and we believe that no book has yet appeared which can gratify to an equal extent the curiosity of the public as to the state of feeling in Russia, and as to the effects of the late war on the Russian nation and its Government. The author remains, for obvious reasons, unknown; but we have ascertained from the best sources that full reliance may be placed on his accuracy and good faith. A writer well acquainted with the Russian language has now numerous sources of information not accessible to us. Considerable freedom has been conceded to the press, and the leading Russian journals are written by men of great ability, who are, in fact, the leaders of the opposition. Within the last twenty years an entire Russian literature of memoirs has arisen, and two monthly periodicals devote their columns to the publication of State papers, old letters and diaries chiefly revealing the dark side of former days. Light, in short, has broken in. It is from these materials that the author of the book before us has compiled the earlier chapters of his work, which treat of the last two generations of Russians since the death of Catherine. He describes in vivid terms the inconceivable abasement of Alexander I. before a fanatical monk; the polished type of the old Russian nobility in the person of Prince Wjäsenski, a man of taste, culture, and good feeling; the brutal type in the person of Ismailoff, the 'Nestor' of Griboyedoff, who tyrannised over his peasants for seven-and-twenty years (down to 1827), immured them in dungeons, and chaffered human beings for a brace of greyhounds; and the opulent Muscovite in the person of the Jakovleffs, from whom sprang Herzen, afterwards editor of the 'Kolokol,' that Bell, or rather tocsin, which first rang the knell of despotism in Russia, but which also, unhappily, undermined all belief in things human and divine. These sketches are extremely amusing, and we commend them to our readers, for they are entirely founded on memoirs written by those persons themselves, or on official documents. They show, too, how

‘Fecunda culpæ sæcula nuptias
Primum inquinavere, et genus, et domos:
Hoc fonte derivata clades
In patriam populumque fluxit.’

But our space is limited, and we must confine ourselves to matters of more direct interest in the present state of affairs.

The Nihilists, or the party of social revolution, who may be said to form a vast conspiracy which has fastened like a cancer on Russian society, including in it devotees of all ranks, even the highest, must not be confounded with the National party, or the Slavophiles, which is animated by a more generous enthusiasm, and has carried away a vast number of adherents in the army, among the younger civil officials, and the clergy, and even the mercantile class. Both these parties are in opposition to the Government, but the former is organised for revolution, the latter for reform; the former conspires with marvellous secrecy, has all the character of a Vehmlic tribunal, acts by terror, and scruples not to commit and to avow any crimes; the latter appeals openly to the nobler aspirations of the people, and, though some of its objects and much of its language are extravagant and pernicious, it would be unjust to confound its patriotic chiefs with the assassins and incendiaries who are carrying on a clandestine warfare against society. The Nationalists were the authors of the late war: they succeeded, after a year of agitation, in conquering the strong repugnance of the Emperor and all his ablest ministers to engage in that conflict; in fact, they created a tide of popular feeling which was too strong for the Government. The Nihilists cared little for the war, except in so far as they foresaw that it weakened the authority of the Government, exhausted its resources, laid bare its corruption, and opened the sluice-gates of revolution, whether by victory or by defeat. Yet by these two parties, sometimes acting in the same direction, though not in concert, and with different ends, Russia has been impelled along a course absolutely contrary to the intentions of her official rulers, and which may lead to self-destruction. The type of the Nihilist party in the volume before us is Michael Bakunin, that of the Nationalists Prince Tcherkasski. They deserve to be better known to Europe.

Michael Bakunin, like most of the champions of Russian Radicalism, belonged by birth and education to the ruling class. He was born in 1814 of an ancient Boyar family settled in the Government of Tver. His education was conducted in the School of Artillery at St. Petersburg, but his military

career was a short one, for at twenty-two he retired to Moscow to live on his private income. There he found a congenial society of young men, who, oddly enough, discovered 'the Algebra of Revolution' in the philosophy of Hegel, then the dominant professor at Berlin. Herzen (who was one of the party) declared that 'this philosophy was essentially Socialistic, and makes men free in a way that no ordinary teaching does, for it leaves no stone in Christendom unturned.' Attracted by the influence of this luminary (though Hegel himself had been dead nine years), Bakunin went to Berlin, where he became an adept of the Hegelian sect, and, under the name of 'Jules Elizard,' began to propound his doctrines in the German 'Jahrbücher' of 1842. In the very first article the editor announces that 'the entire past of the Christian world had been rolled together and made a stepping-stone to the heaven of modern times,' that the 'exclusion of mankind from his earthly paradise had reached its term,' and that 'the universal effort to shake off the past was the sign that a new era had already been born.'

"Have you not read," he says to the advocates of mediation, "the mysterious and dreadful words *Liberté, Egalité et Fraternité*, in front of the Temple of Liberty erected by the French Revolution; and do you not know and feel that these words mean the total annihilation of the existing world of politics and society?" Then, after treating of the Socialistic-religious associations in France and England, which are wholly foreign and opposed to the present world of politics, and "derive their life from sources altogether new and unknown to us," Bakunin concludes as follows:—"The air is sultry; it is charged with storms. Let us therefore cry aloud to our blind brethren, 'Do penance, do penance; the kingdom of the Lord is at hand!' To the Positivists we say, 'Open your spiritual eyes: let the dead bury their dead; and be convinced at last that the Spirit of Intelligence' (*Geist*), the ever-young, the ever new-born, is not to be looked for among the ruins of the past.' Let us also put our trust in this everlasting Spirit, which destroys and annihilates only because it is the fathomless and ever-creating fountain of all life. The joy of destruction is also the joy of creation."

That this rignarole of senseless phrases and hollow abstractions could have appeared in 1842 in the most advanced German periodical of the time, and been lauded by its editor as the *ne plus ultra* of modern philosophical and political wisdom, is a fact too significant of the character of the time and the mental development of Bakunin, to be passed by unnoticed. The half-educated ex-Lieutenant of Artillery, left to himself for years, had gone to Germany with the intention of submitting to revision a teaching received in a crude state from his friend Stankevitch, of repairing and compensating in the Western world of culture the defects of his youthful education, and of learning

the aims and methods of those who had been named to him as the leading exponents of the civilisation of that time. And what had these heralds and representatives of culture, to whom the entire youthful generation of those days looked up with astonishment and awe—what had they to offer him? The same rubbish of mystic formulas, the same “Algebra of Revolution,” with which he and his friends had wasted their time at Moscow; the same blind faith in the universal efficacy of subtle abstractions, which had deluded Herzen and Belinski into imagining that the true conception of the State had only to be proclaimed to be carried at once into practical effect. Not as a disciple, but as a friend and equal, had Bakunin entered the circle of those vain *doctrinaires*, who accounted themselves the forerunners of a new and better dispensation, and looked down upon the world of reality with as much arrogance as himself. It was the glory of this tyro of philosophy to have mastered the conceptions of religion, of nationality, and of history. His maiden effort was lauded as a masterpiece. The wild energy of his passion for destruction was admired as manly decision of character. His belief in the absolute truth of the Negative principle—the depositary, as he called it, of all intelligence—was strengthened into an article of faith. Was it to be wondered at, that with the firm resolve to give immediate and complete effect to his infallible theories, with “the light in front, and the darkness behind him,” Bakunin went his own way, and soon pretended to give laws to and dictate the development of the world of culture, which he had just begun to be acquainted with, and of whose real nature he had scarcely even a superficial idea?

From Germany Bakunin repaired to Paris, where he allied himself with Proudhon and the revolutionists then conspiring against the constitutional monarchy. The Russian Government watched him, and obtained his expulsion from France. But the Revolution of 1848 revived his wildest hopes. The following year was the jubilee of anarchy. Bakunin endeavoured to excite the Slavonic element to destroy the Austrian Empire; but being driven back into Saxony, he was the life and soul of the Dresden insurrection of May 1849. He was captured at Chemnitz, however, by the Prussian troops, and ultimately given up to the Emperor Nicholas in 1851, when he remained in the casemates of the dreaded Schlüsselburg, which lie below the level of the Neva, until he was released from his dungeon on the accession of the present Emperor in 1856, and banished to Eastern Siberia. There he lived as a penal colonist until 1859, when, having been allowed to reside in the territory of the Amoor, he effected his escape to Japan, and finally reached London in 1861, where Herzen, Ogareff, and other Russian refugees were organising the party of opposition to the Government. Bakunin became editor of the ‘*Kolokol*,’ which thenceforth assumed a far more intemperate and aggressive character.

‘Once fairly settled in London, he announced his intention of devoting the remainder of his life exclusively to the task of revolutionising Slavdom. His language showed the same want of principle which had changed the cosmopolitan into a Pan Slavist, and the Pan Slavist into a champion of German revolution. “It is a bad thing,” he wrote in a manifesto dated February 15, 1862, “to exercise one’s energies in a foreign country. My experience has sufficiently taught me that neither in Germany nor France have I ever struck root. My fullest and most ardent sympathies will be directed, as before, to the liberation of mankind in general; but what remains to me now of life and activity I intend to restrict exclusively to the service of Russians, Poles, and Slavs. Of all Slav nationalities, that of Great Russia alone has understood how to preserve her nationality. Let us, therefore, banish the Tartars to the East, and the Germans to Germany. Let us be a free and purely Russian nation.”’

Yet the first thing he did was to insult the organ of the clerical party in Russia, whose influence is so powerful over the people; and by advocating an entire rupture with all religion, culture, and order, the ‘Kolokol’ became the organ of pure Nihilism, which it had not been at first.

We collect in some measure, from a speech delivered by Bakunin to the International League at Berne, what are the leading tenets of this sect. He demanded *the abolition of the State as such*; the extirpation of all religion and of all hereditary rights; the absolute equalisation of all classes:—

‘Communism I abhor, because it is the negation of liberty, and without liberty I cannot imagine anything truly human. I abhor it, because it concentrates all the strength of society in the State, and squanders that strength in its service; because it places all property in the hands of the State, whereas my principle is the abolition of the State itself. I want the organisation of society and the distribution of property to proceed upwards from below, by the free voice of society itself; not downwards from above, by the dictate of authority. I want the abolition of personal hereditary property, which is merely an institution of the State and a consequence of State principles. In this sense I am a Collectivist, not a Communist. . . . Give to all your children, from their birth, the same maintenance and education; then give to all men, so educated, the same social status, and the same means of providing for their wants by their own labour; and you will see that many of the inequalities, now considered natural, will disappear, because they are merely the effects of an unequal distribution of the conditions of development. Improve nature by society, and you will make all things, for all men, as equal as they can be—the conditions of development as well as those of labour—and you will exterminate many crimes, many follies, and many evils.’

After insisting on the necessity of extirpating all religion, he concludes:—

‘To destroy religious superstition by means of education, societies, newspapers, and other methods of propagandism, is a sheer impossibility. Religion is by no means a mere aberration of the brain, but a protest of human nature and the human heart against the misery and the narrowness of the real world around us. Meeting here with nothing but stupidity, injustice, and wretchedness, man creates for himself a better world with the aid of his imagination. . . . Not until happiness and brotherhood are restored to earth, will religion have lost its *raison d’être*. An intellectual crusade will never destroy it; a social revolution is required for that purpose.’

In justice to the ‘International’ itself, it must be said that these extravagant views were not accepted by a large section of its members; and that the society which was about to regenerate mankind was soon bitterly divided against itself.

Bakunin, however, pursued his design of operating on the Slavonic population of Russia, and employed as his agent one Netchayeff, who turned out to be a swindler, and was at last convicted of murder. By such hands as these, tracts, in which the following passages occur, were extensively circulated:—

‘National “robberdom” is one of the most venerable facts of Russian national life: he who does not understand or sympathise with it has neither understanding nor sympathy for our national life. . . . The Russian robber is the true and only revolutionist—no dealer in empty phrases and theories, no mere subverter of politics and class. The robbers who are scattered over the forests, steppes, and villages of Russia form a compact and single world—that of true Russian revolution. He who desires this revolution must repair to this world. Let us therefore take this road; let us throw ourselves among the people; let us join the insurrectionary tumult of peasants and robbers. . . . Leave the academies, universities, and schools; dismiss all thought of literature and science, which in their present form are simply official trammels intended to cramp and unman you. This is the opinion, this the counsel, of the best men of the West.’*

It would seem incredible that this atrocious trash should catch any ear amongst a civilised people. But the credulity of mankind is inexhaustible, and the fact is that these doctrines were eagerly accepted by hundreds of young students and officers in Russia, and that their wide-spread influence has been judicially proved on the trials of the Nihilists, and by the audacious crimes they have both openly and secretly committed. In 1877 one hundred and eighty-three Nihilists were brought to public trial. Within that time, we think, at least

* Foremost among these authorities are the ‘Catechism of Revolution’ and the ‘Missive to Russian Officers,’ both of which preach the duty of political murder and the necessity of blind obedience on the part of the revolutionist to his superior.

fourteen political murders had been committed or attempted, of persons in high official positions, and the incendiary fires in many provinces were counted annually by hundreds, and had destroyed millions of property.*

‘Four years had passed since the trial at Moscow of Netchayeff, the murderer of Ivanoff, first unveiled to the eyes of the nation at large the intrigues of the Socialists and revolutionary Radicals; and this period the party of destruction had made use of with decided success. Over no less than thirty-seven provinces of the empire had the net been spread from St. Petersburg, by means of which the “people”—in other words, the proletariat in the towns and the peasants in the poorer districts—were to be drawn into the interest of the young enthusiasts, both male and female, who espoused the doctrines of Bakunin and Tschernitchewski. But the Government meanwhile had laid their plans, and at length the swoop was made. On one and the same day, in May 1875, these revolutionary fanatics were seized, according to a prearranged scheme of the Third Section, throughout the limits and corners of the empire. Every class of society, and all the governments of Russia, with the exception of the Baltic provinces and Finland, had furnished its contingent. The main body of the accused, excepting those at St. Petersburg itself, came from certain provinces of the Volga, from Lithuania, and the south of New Russia. Most of them were the sons and daughters of small officials and village priests, and had been at the higher institutes of education. There were not wanting a few, however, who belonged to the high nobility, as well as some of the labouring classes. It was remarked, in particular, that numerous young Jews from Lithuania had taken part in the conspiracy.’

Ninety-nine of these prisoners were convicted. But the trial did the Government more harm than good. The impassioned eloquence with which men like Myshkin from Siberia, and Rabinovitch defended their wild principles, awakened public sympathy to such a degree that the presiding judge had to clear the court; and the jubilant acclamations of the public on the acquittal of Vera Sassulitsch, the murderess of General

* Respecting the fires which have occurred *during June alone of this year* (1879), the ‘Official Advertiser’ has the following:—Altogether there have been 3,501 fires, of which 930 arose from carelessness, 310 were caused by lightning, 508 by incendiarism, either proved or suspected, and 1,753 were due to causes unknown. The total damage amounts to over twelve millions of roubles; viz. more than two millions at St. Petersburg, one and a half millions at Uralsk, &c. These and many other statements are appropriated by Mr. Cunliffe-Owen, without the smallest indication of the source from which they are derived, in an article on ‘Russian Nihilism,’ in the last number of the ‘Nineteenth Century.’

Trephoff, proved that the teaching of Bakunin had not been vain. He himself continued to reside in Switzerland, and to carry on thence his revolutionary propaganda until his death, which took place at Berne in 1878. It is impossible to doubt that the growth of revolutionary principles and crimes has sprung in Russia from this seed. It was here, and still is, a mortal struggle between secret societies and despotic force. The last declaration of the Czar, after the explosion at Moscow, was to the effect that the authors of these crimes must be exterminated. But as long as the curse of arbitrary power rests upon the Empire, and as long as that power is used to screen corruption, to pervert justice, to crush the people of Russia, and to attack her neighbours, the cause even of these mad Nihilists has an advantage over the cause of military despotism.

In a remarkable chapter on academical education in Russia, this writer attributes the diffusion of these anarchical doctrines mainly to the discontent and disaffection prevailing amongst professors and students; and he believes them to be very widely diffused indeed. Speaking of the attempt made last April to assassinate the Czar, he says:—

‘As long as the present feeling of insecurity continues, and the students regard themselves as the ill-treated and suspected pariahs of the Government, they form a world by themselves, one vast conspiracy against existing order. Solovieff was no isolated specimen of a traitor; his sphere of action extended from St. Petersburg to the provinces south of the Volga; he carried on his intrigues for weeks in the towns and governments of Moscow, Novgorod, Nishni-Novgorod, Vladimir, and Saratoff. Everywhere he met with friends and sympathisers, who not only encouraged but actively assisted him. He had connexions at his disposal which secured for him an entrance into the most various circles of society, provided for all his wants, and even procured for him the necessary false passports. He formed and dissolved such connexions by the hundred, without ever meeting with a single traitor or ever being troubled by the police. Wherever Solovieff discovered himself as a member of the secret conspiracy, he was at home; for everywhere there are unclassed students who are his born confederates. According to his statement there existed a vast number of “Radical quarters” at St. Petersburg, where the “comrades” periodically assembled. At Nishni-Novgorod friends are immediately at hand to nurse their fellow-conspirators who fall ill. On the estate of Voronino the revolutionists go in and out unmolested, and the smithy adjoining this property, which is well known as the trysting-place of revolutionary students, male and female, maintains a regular connexion with other workshops of the kind.’

And he proceeds to show, in a chapter of equal interest on female education, that similar extravagances have spread

amongst the gymnasia for female students; and it is an undoubted fact that the misguided enthusiasm of women plays a large and active part in these conspiracies and crimes.

The party of the Nationalists, or Slavophiles, is, as we have already observed, entirely distinct from, and in many respects opposed to, that of the Nihilists. The Nihilists aim at the destruction of the State; the Nationalists would increase and extend its power. The former seek to effect an internal social revolution; the latter, to crush all external elements by the paramount ascendancy of an absolute military Slavonic power. The crimes which have recently afflicted Russia and astonished Europe were the work of the mysterious conspiracy of the Nihilists. The Russo-Turkish war was the work of the enthusiastic appeals of the Nationalists to the passions of the nation. But this party took its origin, and had made its influence felt long before, by a resolute attempt to root out of Russia whatever was not of a purely Russian character:—

‘When the Moscow Slavophiles, now forty years ago, first entered the public arena, they figured as a party of opposition. In the system of the Emperor Nicholas there seemed to be no place left for politicians who rejected the bureaucracy of that time, organised after the German pattern, and served in great part by officials and generals of German origin, and who, in their disgust with the nobility and the higher classes in general for their alleged desertion of national traditions, fixed their hopes on the “pure and uncontaminated peasantry,” and demanded the abolition of serfdom. Men like Aksakoff, Kirejewski, Chomjakoff, and others, of independent mind, and imbued with a genuine love of liberty, were not to be deceived by the quasi-National professors of the old *régime*. They declared, indeed, their assent, when the emperor designated the supremacy of the Greek Orthodox Church and the Russian language, and the expulsion of the Turks from the ancient Byzantium, as the respective objects of his home and foreign policy. But the means employed for the attainment of these ends were as distasteful to them as to their rivals the “European Liberals,” with whom at first they were on so friendly a footing that Alexander Herzen used to call the Slavophiles “*nos amis les ennemis*.” The Government allowed these young enthusiasts to go on within certain limits, but regarded them in general with suspicion.’

The first efforts of this party of half democratic, half absolutist Russianisers, represented by one Chanykoff and Juri Samarin, were directed against the German polity and institutions of the Baltic provinces. The aristocracy of Livonia and Esthonia, who had given so many able servants to the Russian Government, were denounced, the municipal and provincial liberties invaded, the Lutheran Church persecuted.

'The legislative work, which had been directed to the reconstitution of the Baltic municipalities in conformity with the requirements of the time, to a representation of the Estates, and to the reform of the judicial system, was virtually annulled. Renewed efforts were made to enforce the use of the Russian language in the transactions of the Government authorities of the three provinces. It was attempted even to win over the rural proletariat to the Greek Church by the offer of a distribution of State property. The German press of Livonia, Esthonia, and Courland was gagged by redoubling the severity of the censorship, whilst the anti-German diatribes of the Russian journals were sedulously encouraged. A number of Russian churches and schools were founded; the administration of Livonia (Esthonia and Courland came off much better in this respect) was placed in the hands of governors and high officials who were as incompetent as they were anti-German in sentiment; and all endeavours to maintain constitutional privileges were trampled down with unmerciful severity.'

The ill-judged Polish insurrection of 1863 afforded to the Nationalists a signal opportunity for the application of their theories to that unhappy country. The Government resolved to abandon the scheme of reconciliation elaborated under the auspices of the Polish Marquis Wielopolski, and entrusted for execution to the Grand Duke Constantine, as Viceroy of Poland, and to adopt the extensive plan which Miliutin had proposed for the reorganisation of the former kingdom. A remodelling of agrarian regulations and of Polish administration was taken in hand, which aimed at removing the nobles and clergy, as political incorrigibles, from their historical position and the enjoyment of their property, and making the Russian domination over the 'province of the Vistula' rest upon the sympathies of the Polish peasant class, now suddenly converted into proprietors. The system of emancipation and reorganisation, so favourable to the peasants and so injurious to the nobles, which had been rejected for Russia, was applied to Poland in its harshest form, and Miliutin, its author, was entrusted with its execution. He went to work with the zeal of a genuine fanatic. His first step was to put the most important offices into the hands of political volunteers, his friends and associates of 1859; to declare the Russification of Poland a holy mission; to exclude all Poles from any share in the administration of their country; and to get despatched to Warsaw whole troops of youthful devotees of the new gospel of Slavism. Of these one of the most zealous and prominent was the young Prince Tcherkasski, become suddenly an actual Councillor of State, Director of the Government Commission at Warsaw for internal and ecclesiastical affairs, and a member of the Polish Council of State, now transformed

into a Committee of Organisation. Miliutin, who afterwards received the office and title of Secretary of State for Poland, introduced the men in his confidence to their new offices, but returned, when this was done, to St. Petersburg, in order to promote his policy with effect, and to be able to meet the attacks which soon were made from all sides against this monstrous enterprise of converting a compact Polish country into a Russian province, and, in Tcherkasski's own words, of 'uprooting Latindom to replace it by a thoroughly Slav civilisation.'

We do not propose to follow our author into this part of his subject, but this occurrence is remarkable because it raised into notice an individual who was destined, twelve years later, to play a great part in Bulgaria. Prince Tcherkasski was a young man of fortune in St. Petersburg, descended from a Georgian family who had adopted the Slavophil ideas. When municipal institutions were granted to the Russian cities, the prince consented to be nominated for the mayoralty of Moscow; he was elected by a large majority, and in that capacity he had claimed and obtained precedence over the governor of the province.

'But beyond enjoying these pretentious externals of municipal representation, the good citizens of "Mother Moscow" were not intended to go. The new mayor treated his colleagues and subordinates so harshly and imperiously that angry quarrels and dissensions soon arose, which were well-nigh fatal to the working of the communal machinery. His predilection for corporal punishment, which not even the peasants' friend of 1859 and the democratic reorganiser of Poland was able to conceal, was an obstacle, in particular, to harmony. Even his friends and partisans were forced to shrug their shoulders when they heard that no word was so constantly on his lips as the old national, but long since unfashionable, rod (*Rosgi*).'

He soon afterwards resigned his civic office, which relapsed into the hands of the burghers for whom it was intended.

This, however, was the man who was designated by the Slav committees, even before the outbreak of the war, to be at the head of the administration of the provinces about to be wrested from the Turkish Empire. In November 1876, the military command of the army of invasion having been divided between the Grand Dukes Nicholas and Michael, Tcherkasski was named Chief Civil Commissioner, and a complete scheme of administration was expected of him for the territories about to be invaded. It will be observed that this was just *before* the Conference of Constantinople which met in December. The prince accepted the office on condition that he should

exercise an undivided power and select all his own officers. His first act was to surround himself exclusively with young officers selected from the various regiments of the Guards—men totally ignorant of civil administration and of the people they were to govern. We shall now see from competent authority in what the Russian ‘liberation’ of the Bulgarians consisted.

‘Even before the Imperial army had crossed the Danube (June 29, 1877), Tcherkasski’s head-quarters were crowded with governors, vice-governors, and superintendents of districts for every part of Bulgaria, and with commandants and majors *de la place* for all the strongholds that lay between the Danube and the Bosphorus. All these rulers *in partibus*, ever since they had crossed the Roumanian frontier, drew enormous salaries and a liberal allowance of daily pay, which Bulgaria had to provide. Each governor drew 7,000 roubles, and had, besides that, a separate fund of from six to ten thousand roubles to dispose of, for which he was not required to account. The vice-governors had each 3,500 roubles, together with a similar fund in proportion. The superintendents of districts and heads of police had 2,500 roubles and another 1,500 roubles for travelling expenses. All these salaries were paid in hard gold; every official, moreover, had received in advance his military pay for the year, and (as had been the custom in Turkestan) a double allowance for travelling expenses. When doubts were expressed about the wisdom of saddling with such serious burdens the Bulgarians “whom they were about to liberate,” the answer was forthcoming at once, that the Turkish pasha government, at any rate, had been still more expensive, and that the blessings of political liberty could not be purchased too dearly.

‘Of the instructions promised to the officials of the civil administration, not one, at the outbreak of the war, was ready. Tcherkasski, as the hero of the “system” and a connoisseur in such matters, thought it necessary to collect at once “materials for the study of Bulgaria,” and to have them worked up by a specially appointed commission for the use and behoof of his subordinates. But the contents of the work were limited to the translation of fragmentary extracts from a couple of foreign *brochures* which chance had thrown into the hands of the commissioners.

‘Equipped with these materials, the young lieutenants and captains of cavalry, suddenly called upon to reorganise Southern Slavdom, went to work after the greater part of the territory, fixed upon as the scene of their exploits, had been occupied at the end of July by the Russian forces. The simplest thing, under these circumstances, would have been to maintain the existing institutions, to let the Bulgarians govern themselves, and to be content with controlling this self-government, which, in its fundamental aspect, already prevailed. But to this Tcherkasski would not listen. Just as if it had been intended to make the very name of Russians hated by those “brethren” whom they came to free, the supreme civil administrator played the part from the first of an absolute master, who had come to model all he

found after his own pattern. Even before the Russian troops had crossed the Danube, a deputation of Bulgarian notables, consisting chiefly of representatives of the so-called Young Bulgarian party, arrived at Plojeshti, who solemnly welcomed the emperor and his generals in the name of the nation, and sought to unfold in detail their wishes and aspirations. His Majesty and the old Prince Gortchakoff received them with unusual amiability, and honoured them with a long audience. Just as unamiable, not to say hostile, was the reception these gentlemen met with from Tcherkasski. "In the most 'offensive terms,' so an eye-witness relates, "they were told they must 'not fancy they were there to represent the Bulgarian people. Bulgaria had no national assembly, and would not obtain any. In tones 'of downright menace he warned them to get rid at once of any political chimeras of that sort. When one of the Bulgarians attempted 'to make a statement in reply, he was peremptorily stopped with the 'remark, 'We have no need of your wisdom. You have to listen and "obey, not to argue.'"

What followed was of a piece with this instructive beginning. Notwithstanding the pompous announcement at head-quarters of the institution of a new agrarian system and the abolition of existing taxes, throughout most of the occupied territory an arbitrary state of rule prevailed, under which the Turks who remained behind and their Greek adherents found themselves much better off than the "liberated "brethren," whom the new civil administration addressed not in the Bulgarian but the Russian language, and in the Russian manner of the old school, namely, with whip in hand. Among Tcherkasski's first measures, published already in the Imperial proclamation, had been the promise that the tax paid by the Rayahs for exemption from military service and the tithes levied on all natural products should be abolished "for ever." The news of this boon was still in everyone's mouth, when the civil administration announced that the latter impost would continue to be levied for the present, wherever the Russian troops were, for the proper provisioning of the army. As the whole country bristled with soldiers, the promised blessing profited nobody. But the bad feeling aroused by this counter-ordinance was universal, and was heightened to discontent and embitterment, when after a month it was announced that the tithes would be levied not in natural produce, as before, but in hard cash, that is to say, in a form at once the most inconvenient and oppressive to the landed tax-payers. The iniquity of this proceeding was crowned by the fact that its origin was not disguised, and that all the world was taught what Tcherkasski's much-vaunted energy and independence really meant. The levying of tithes in hard cash had been the work of the three great army contractors Horwitz, Greger, and Kohan, who found it inconvenient, as a matter of business, to collect the natural products, and had used all their influence to bring about the change.

'The same was the case with the remodelling of the agrarian system and of the local communal administration. Total strangers to their new position, and tormented with the fear that beneath the aspirations of the so-called Young Bulgarian party there might lurk

the same revolutionary and Nihilist tendencies which they had had to combat in their native country, the soldier-civilians of Tcherkasski's administration looked to the enforcement of strict discipline and unconditional obedience as the sum and substance of their mission. The imperious demeanour of their chief, who brooked no contradiction, and was bent on carrying through his radical "system" with all the means and appliances of absolutism, had deluded them into thinking that his objects would be better served by a vigorous use of the Cossack's whip (*Nagaika*) than by fulfilling the hopes of the Bulgarian nation. "I feel as if I were stuck in an enchanted wood," said a district superintendent to M. Utin; "I am burdened by a mass of duties, without knowing how to perform them. My only comfort is, that it is the same with others; and that nobody really knows what he has to do, and what he may do." "The best emancipation for the Bulgarians," said another, "is the *Nagaika*. I am quite aware that our brethren, as we call them, cannot endure me; but I am equally indifferent to their affection or their hatred. These people are good for nothing, and must be kept under strict discipline. They fear me now, at all events, for they know that I let no misconduct escape me. Whoever does wrong has twenty-five lashes counted out to him; and then there is an end of it." "What do I care?" said a third. "I insist that they shall live quietly and peaceably with each other. The much-abused Turks do as I bid them, and leave the Bulgarians at peace. I insist that the latter shall do likewise. Whoever stirs a finger against his neighbour, gets a taste of the *Nagaika*."

With such a disposition among the numerous servants of the administration, it is not surprising that they proceeded very irregularly in dealing with the communal and agrarian organisation, and repeatedly acted in direct opposition to the intentions of the government. In many parts the old rule of the *Tchorbadji* was simply retained as it was, and dignified with the name of the new organisation. In others, everything was senselessly and indiscriminately overturned, and a mob reign of terror was instituted, which, after the catastrophe at Plevna and the evacuation of much of the newly occupied territory, was naturally followed by a fearful and bloody retribution by the Turks.

No wonder that the Bulgarians have been somewhat deficient in gratitude to their 'liberators.' After the Turkish victories in the early part of the campaign, matters grew worse. As the Russians retreated, they left the Christian population behind without food or protection. The work of re-organisation was suspended, and the young officers of the Guard resigned in disgust. But after the fall of Plevna Prince Tcherkasski was allowed to resume his work precisely where he had left off, notwithstanding the indignation his proceedings had excited even in Russia.

'The most prejudiced and short-sighted of the Moscow patriots could not but acknowledge that this violent and despotic policy, carried on in Bulgaria in the name of the Slavish National cause, was entirely

counter to all Russian as well as Slavish interests; besides creating the danger of bringing the Russian name into ill repute in the South Slavonic countries of the East, just as it had done in the countries of the former Poland and Lithuania. For the failure, moreover, notwithstanding all the efforts of a century, to bridge over the gulf between the Slavs of Great Russia, Lithuania, and Livonia, the differences of history and creed could be alleged as an excuse. But no such excuses could be alleged in the case of Bulgaria. And in Serbia matters were already even worse. Here the crusade against Turkey in 1876 had been undertaken by Russians and Servians in common, and had ended in a common defeat, and painful quarrels between the leaders of the allies. What would be the result if the proverbially patient and pliant Bulgarians were likewise to renounce their friendship to Russia and declare her rule incompatible with the freedom and dignity of man? What prospect was left for the establishment of a great empire of the future, extending from the Volga to the Moldau, if every Russian attempt to restore a genuine National organisation was to end in failure and disunion between the liberators and the liberated? if that incapacity for establishing civil order, which the Novgorodians of 862 complained of to the Varagian chief, should be the epitaph on the grave of Slavo-Russian development?

“The impression produced by these revelations upon the many admirers of the prince, who had hailed him as the pioneer of a new era of freedom and national development, can be gathered best from the following words of Stassulevitch:—“The example before us teaches us,” he says, “that if our present Slavophiles were suddenly to attain to “power and influence in Russia, they would not be a whit more “liberal than the men now in power, whom, as types of the ‘St. “‘Petersburg period,’ they have criticised so severely. They would “use exactly the same means—such as the employment of military “persons for civil administration, the appointment of a large and costly “staff, the suppression of all independence among those who are subject “to their rule; they would resort, in a word, to absolutism pure and “simple.”

Fortunately for all parties, about twelve weeks after the fall of Plevna, and on the very day the Treaty of San Stefano was signed, Prince Tcherkasski suddenly died; else he had been designated by the Russian Government for the office which has since been much more ably and honourably filled by Prince Dondoukoff. But the misery caused by these events to the wretched inhabitants of Bulgaria did not end with the war. The policy of extermination, of which some English fanatics were the advocates and Russia the executioner, has been but too fully carried out; and, even in the present distressed condition of the world, there is no suffering more severe than that which has been inflicted on the Greek and Mohammedan population of the Balkan provinces.

It is needless for us to repeat what excitement and enthusiasm impelled Russia to war. The traditional aspiration of centuries for the conquest of Byzantium, the vehement appeals of the Nationalist party to the sympathy of race, and, above all, the fanaticism of the Eastern Church, contributed alike to inflame the ambition of the nation.

‘It is only since the close of the Crimean war, and the commencement of the new era ushered in by the accession of Alexander II., that Panslavist ideas have acquired a larger field for their display, and begun to play a part in politics. A real significance has been given to them only within the last few years. Even at this day the enthusiasm of Russians for their brethren of race beyond the frontiers of the empire is only a kind of pastime or plaything—a modern liberal garb for the ancient and deep-rooted interest which the orthodox nation really took in her orthodox brethren in the faith, and which the clergy—especially the monastic portion, who are imbued at the present day with Byzantine Ultramontanism—have consciously and intentionally nurtured. The first Slavophiles themselves were ecclesiastical zealots, devotees of Byzantine patristicism, and enthusiasts for that form of ultra-orientalism which they called Russian civilisation. For these reasons they were little inclined to discriminate between the politico-national and the ecclesiastical conceptions of the Eastern question, or to recognise a contradiction of interests between the two.

‘The Slavo-National idea, viewed as an independent factor in the Eastern policy of Russia, dates, as we have said, from very recent days. It is an additional impulse, but by no means the only one, to be taken into account when estimating the force of the movement which has agitated the Russian people since the summer of 1876. As regards the educated classes of society and the zeal with which they have taken this agitation in hand, the solidarity of Slav interests is a matter, no doubt, of some importance. But the real strength of the popular movement is to be sought elsewhere; it lies in the ecclesiastical past of Russia.’

The war of 1853 was the act of the Emperor Nicholas; the war of 1877 was the act of the Russian nation. For the first time in their history, the Government was dragged reluctantly along by a popular movement, and the first deadly blow was dealt at autocratic authority. The cry of the Liberal party was—

‘For Russia to be truly free and to direct her own destinies, she must follow the example set before her, and solve the Slav question as her peculiar interests dictated. “Russian life,” they said, “has acquired a new meaning and purport. It can only acquire new forms “by expanding itself to embrace the collective vitality of Slavdom. Thus only will Russia gain the power of stifling the elements of “Romanism and Germanism which have invaded her frontiers, and “of erecting on those frontiers a firm bulwark against the ‘Eastern

“ ‘ advance ’ of Germany, doubly dangerous since the victories of 1866 “ and 1870.” ”

The Emperor and his ministers saw the danger, but were incapable of resisting the force of the popular will. They capitulated in the celebrated speech delivered at Moscow on April 24, and shortly afterwards M. Aksakoff exclaimed :—

‘ Already beyond the Russian frontier is unfurled the national standard, raised to give back freedom and the rights of man to the orthodox peoples of the Balkan peninsula, whom Europe, so proud of her enlightenment, has enslaved, humbled, and despised. The slumbering East is now awakened; and not only the Slavs of the Balkans, but the whole Slavonic world, await its regeneration. A new epoch is approaching; the dawn of the great Slavonic day has at length begun to break.’

These sanguine hopes were somewhat dashed by the consciousness that Russia had no general capable of commanding a great army, and that the actual command was given to a Grand Duke, whose signal incapacity led to the catastrophe of Plevna. The revulsion in the public mind was terrible.

‘ Not only had the Russians been beaten in two great battles, and forced to remove their head-quarters from Tirnova to Biela, but the commander-in-chief had lost so completely all composure and self-confidence, that the assistance of the hated and despised Roumanians and the ill-treated Servians was invoked at his request. The Guards were ordered to the Danube, and, regardless of the urgency of harvest labour, the Government decreed an immediate calling out of the militia (*Opoltschénie*). The private letters from the seat of war contained still worse tidings than the newspapers. The cause of all these terrible reverses, they said, was neither a sinister combination of circumstances nor the superiority of the enemy. They were due solely to the incapacity and recklessness of the commander-in-chief. The “insane” attempt against Plevna” had been arranged by the Grand Duke personally, against the advice of his most experienced officers, and although old General Krüdener had been down on his knees before him to dissuade him from the venture. Even then it was continued with criminal obstinacy for two whole days, notwithstanding the palpable impossibility of success. Blinded with immeasurable self-assurance before the repulse, and inaccessible to every objection raised against the premature assaults upon the stronghold, the Grand Duke after the catastrophe is said to have been the most disheartened of them all, and one of the accessories of the panic which revealed to the gaze of Europe the full extent of the disasters. The utter helplessness, confusion, mistrust, and mutual recriminations which prevailed throughout the army were openly ascribed to head-quarters. Those who had been as haughty and arrogant in the day of success as they were despondent in the day of adversity had infected all ranks with their vicious example.’

At Moscow the depression was even greater than at St. Petersburg. On the first news of these reverses, the establishment of a central Assembly of Delegates was mooted, to supervise the proceedings of the Government. One of the leading journals proved that a war so carried on must lead to bankruptcy, and it was a matter of general and painful regret 'that the Emperor should have let himself be persuaded to look, like a modern Xerxes from his imperial pavilion,' on this scene of bloodshed. It happens that we used the very same expression in this Journal at the time. It was thought severe; but the comparison appears to have occurred to the Russians themselves.

As the fortune of war varied, and the Imperial forces once more advanced, the tone of the public changed, and the Emperor was welcomed to his capital with demonstrations of joy. But they fell upon a dull and desponding ear. He felt that no bridge of retreat was left for reverting to the state of things abandoned by the declaration of war. The Czarewitch was in flagrant opposition to his father, and advocated a bold and resolute policy abroad and a searching reform at home. The Emperor longed for peace, and was seconded by Count Schouvaloff. Had his personal inclinations prevailed, a halt would have been made at Adrianople, and negotiations quietly opened at Stamboul. But the time for such counsels was past. It was impossible to stop the march of the army; it was impossible to oppose the enthusiastic belief of all classes and all parties that the hour of final triumph had arrived. Ignatieff and M. Nelidoff were entrusted with the conduct of the peace negotiations, which were enveloped in a mystery offensive to the friendly Powers; and the Russian nation was left under the delusion that the last word had already been spoken about the future of Constantinople and the East.

The Treaty of San Stefano was the result. The first impression of that instrument in Russia was one of astonishment at its modesty and moderation. No one conceived it possible that the terms could be revised or modified. The only question was whether the army ought not for a time to occupy Constantinople. But these illusions were soon dispelled.

'The first bitter disappointment was prepared for Russia, now intoxicated with the prospect of certain triumph, by the appearance of the British fleet in the Bosphorus, and by the impression produced by this event at the head-quarters of the Grand Duke Nicholas. The "impossible" had come to pass. The army remained, as if rooted to the spot, outside the gates of that city which since the days of Igor and Oleg had never seen the face of a Muscovite invader. For months the

Russian soldiers looked wistfully at the Mosque of St. Sophia, and dared not stretch out their hands to reach the Jerusalem of Slav orthodoxy and take possession of the inheritance of the Comneni. In the eyes of the Government the fear of intervention from the "despised West" outweighed the apprehension of wounding the popular spirit and neglecting the sacred traditions of the past. Aksakoff and his friends raged furiously, but in vain. They were forced to confess that the cause of Western civilisation was not yet defunct, and that the name of England had still some meaning in the world.'

We do not envy the feelings of any Englishman, of whatever party he may be, who can read these words from a Russian pen without a feeling of honest pride!

The subsequent proceedings of the Congress at Berlin raised to the highest pitch of exasperation the disappointment of the Nationalists. The Slavonic Benevolent Society declared that 'even the most malevolent enemy of Russia and her dynasty could not have invented anything more destructive to her internal peace and tranquillity. The authors of the treaty were the true Nihilists, men for whom there exists neither a Russia nor Russian tradition, no Russian nationality, no orthodox Church.' In some respects the accusation was true, for the profound discontent of the nation had destroyed all confidence in the Czar.

'The moment chosen for the declaration of war, the manner in which it was declared, the mode of preparation for the war, and the way in which it was conducted; the system of alliances relied on; the proceedings of diplomacy, beginning with its mouth full of big phrases, and ending by humbling itself in the dust—everything, in short, was said to have deceived the confidence and the trusting devotion of the nation. Everything had gone differently to what had been expected. No one seemed to have been left who was able to maintain authority. The foundations on which the *régime* of 1863-77 had rested were undermined as completely as the *régime* of Old Russia by the Crimean war. Close upon the conclusion of peace began the era of political assassinations and revolutionary plots. What had previously been whispered only in the circles of the *enragés* was now publicly proclaimed by the "Moscow Gazette." No attempt was made any longer to conceal the fact that the Treaty of Berlin had shaken the existing system of government to its very foundations. The consequences of the war recoiled upon the dynasty, of whom it was said that it neither wished for nor prevented the war; that it had neither the courage nor the capacity to begin it at the right time, to conduct it properly, or to break it off when the proper moment arrived.'

Having reached this climax, we stop. It would weaken the effect of it if we attempted to relate the details of defective organisation, cruel injustice, brutal inhumanity to the sick and wounded, broken contracts, scandalous depredation, and mili-

tary incapacity, which gradually became known in Russia, and completed the disgust and humiliation of the nation. These things are related at length in the volume before us, and they will prove instructive to those who regarded the policy of Russia in a different light. Nothing certainly that has been said by any foreign writer approaches in severity to these extraordinary and authentic disclosures.

We cannot close these remarks without expressing the sympathy and compassion we feel for the Emperor Alexander II. We believe him to be upon the whole the most humane and right-minded ruler who has ever sat upon the Russian throne. But although he is animated by the best intentions, and said to be invested with absolute power, almost every act of his reign has turned against him, and he is now driven, in defence of his life, within the last entrenchments of despotism. A state of intolerable tension is the result, and it is not improbable that his reign may end by some catastrophe.

The author of this work has added to the English edition of it, now first published in a very vigorous and idiomatic translation, an epilogue in which he touches on the events of the last few months, especially on the conclusion of the Austro-German alliance, and on the renewed attempts on the life of the Czar. The Austro-German Treaty is primarily a measure of defence against Russia, and it is certain that the contingency of a Russian invasion of Germany is one which weighs upon the mind of Prince Bismarck, the more so as it might well let loose once more the armies of France. Against these dangers he has sought to provide. For the first time since the partition of Poland there is latent hostility between the partitioning Powers, and the presence of a large Russian army on the Vistula is a source of uneasiness both in Vienna and in Berlin. Russia herself is for the first time entirely isolated, even more so than she was during the Crimean war, and the simplest prudence would recommend her to renounce or suspend her aggressive and warlike policy, and to devote her whole power to the internal reforms of the Empire. But it is the almost insuperable difficulty of that task which constitutes the chief danger to the peace of Europe. Sooner or later it is impossible to doubt that some form of constitutional government, some check on the blind omnipotence of autocracy, will penetrate into Russia, and be established there. No other State in the civilised world is without it. She herself has agreed to establish it in the provinces which have been detached from the Ottoman Empire. The Russian people are at this hour

less free than Roumanians, Bulgarians, and Greeks. This cannot last.

‘If nothing is done,’ says our author, ‘to relieve the intolerable pressure of arbitrary rule, and to respond to the wishes for reform entertained by all Russians of sense and moderation; and if the Government persists in a foreign policy intended solely and incessantly to distract the attention of the National party towards abroad—then the only question to be decided, and to be decided very shortly, will be this: Whether Europe will live to see first the collapse of the old system of absolutism, and then a foreign war for the purpose of diverting the national mind, or whether a war is to come first (begun with the help of France), and the revolution is to follow at the news of the first defeat. Every day serves to illustrate more clearly the enormous ravages of discontent and internal decomposition, and yet nowhere in Russian society are the vestiges or symptoms of a reaction discernible. Even those who speak of a reaction do not believe in its possibility, and manifest by their conduct that the measure of the evils under which the nation groans is greater than the measure of those difficulties and disturbances which they think are to be feared from a violent overthrow of the present system.’

He holds, too, that the first use which emancipated Russian society would make of its liberty would consist in resuming the policy of Eastern conquest and declaring a war of revenge against the authors of the Berlin Treaty. Against this danger he principally relies on the Austro-German alliance, supported, as he hopes, by the firm resolution of England and her influence with France to protect the peace of the world. Such a combination of the central and maritime Powers might defy the attacks of revolutionary warfare, whether from the East or from the West; and whilst we desire nothing more cordially than to see the Russian nation advance in freedom and prosperity within its own frontiers, we trust that nothing will shake the determination of Europe to oppose its inveterate tendency to enlarge them. Meanwhile we again most strongly commend this book to our readers.

ART. VIII.—*Life and Letters of Gilbert Elliot, First Earl of Minto, from 1807 to 1814, while Governor-General of India.* Being a Sequel to his ‘Life and Letters,’ published in 1874. Edited by his Great-Niece, the Countess of MINTO. London: 1880.

THE publication, five years ago, of his ‘Life and Letters’ has made the first Earl of Minto one of the best-known to us of the public men of the great revolutionary period. That delightful work, however, did not deal with his administration as Governor-General of India, which was reserved for a separate publication. This has now been given to us by the hand of the same accomplished editor, and if it does not deal with scenes of such exciting interest for English readers as those which describe English political life during the stormy and eventful period in which Lord Minto’s youth and middle age were passed, it is at least a most valuable and interesting record of an important chapter in the history of British India, admirably told. The story is mainly given in Lord Minto’s own letters, full of humour and wisdom, while displaying in every line those traits of affection and kindness in the writer’s character which made him so deservedly beloved by relations and friends. Although the letters are modestly said to be ‘edited,’ it is hardly necessary to tell the readers of the earlier work that an accurate knowledge of affairs has been brought to the task, or that the connecting narrative has been written with equal judgment and good taste.

Gilbert Elliot, first Earl of Minto, was born in 1751, and educated partly in France, where he was the schoolfellow of Mirabeau—who contracted a warm and lasting friendship for him—and afterwards at Edinburgh and Oxford. He was called to the bar, and practised for a short time with promise of distinction; but succeeding to the headship of the family as fourth baronet, on his father’s death in 1777, he exchanged the law for politics, entering Parliament first for Morpeth, and shortly afterwards replacing his father as member for Roxburghshire. He now became the intimate friend of Burke and Windham, and a declared follower of Fox, and, joining with them in the motion for enquiry into Warren Hastings’s conduct in India, took an active share in the trial which followed, first earning distinction by his speech in the House of Commons moving the impeachment of the infamous Impey, a performance spoken of by Burke in almost extravagant terms of eulogy. In 1789 he was proposed by the Opposition as

Speaker against William Grenville. When, in 1792, the Whig party broke up, owing to the differences which had arisen among them out of the progress of the French Revolution, Sir Gilbert Elliot joined the section, including Burke and Windham, under the nominal leadership of the Duke of Portland, which gave a general support to Pitt's Administration, although he himself refused to take office. In the following year, however, he accepted the mission pressed on him by the Ministry of British Commissioner to Toulon, and on the evacuation of that place he was instrumental in bringing about the cession of Corsica to Great Britain, and was nominated Viceroy of the island, in which capacity he remained until the island was given up in 1796. For his services on these occasions he was raised to the peerage as Baron Minto. In 1799 he was sent as Ambassador to Vienna, and remained there until Pitt's retirement from office in 1801, when he resigned his situation and returned to England. When, on the formation of Pitt's second Administration in 1804, Lord Grenville and Windham refused the overtures made to them to join it, Lord Minto elected to stay out with his friends, although giving a general support to the Government, which he deemed to be the duty of men of all parties in the critical circumstances of the times. When, on Pitt's death in the beginning of 1806, the Ministry of 'All the Talents' came into power, Lord Minto took office for the first time, as President of the Board of Control, but without the seat in the Cabinet to which his services and abilities fully entitled him. The exclusion was probably due to a certain shyness and the entire absence of self-assertion in his character. In ability, experience, and the general estimation held of him, he was certainly superior to some of those who were placed higher.

During the greater part of his Parliamentary life, it was Lord Minto's custom to come up to town for the season alone, his wife and family remaining at the ancestral home in Roxburghshire. And during some portion of his absences abroad he was necessarily by himself. It is to these enforced separations, grudgingly assented to by a man attached in a more than ordinary degree to wife and children, and who set a highest value on the calmer pleasures of home and home life, that we owe one of the most valuable and entertaining contributions to the history of the period that have appeared within the time of the present generation, the 'Life and Letters,' edited with equal skill and taste by his great-niece, the present Countess of Minto, and published about five years ago, to which reference has already been made.

The offer of the Governor-Generalship of India was made to Lord Minto when he was at the Board of Control, in consequence of the repugnance expressed by the Court of Directors to accept Lord Lauderdale, Fox's nominee; it was accompanied by the assurance that his acceptance of the office would be approved by the Government, the directors, and the public. The offer was at first decidedly refused, but, on being renewed some weeks later, was finally accepted, not without many regrets and misgivings, in this case unreservedly real and sincere. It involved a prolonged separation from his wife and most of his family, for Lady Minto's health precluded her accompanying him; and this at a time of life when, as one's little capital of living is so fast running out, we grudge to lose each passing year. However, the prospect of benefiting both his country and his family finally determined him to go. Lord Minto sailed from Portsmouth, in a frigate commanded by his second son, in February 1807, being then fifty-six years old. The voyage to Madras was made in four months—not bad sailing as voyages went in those days. Although he was detained there for a fortnight while the 'Modeste' was fitted with a new foremast, he could not assume an official position, since his commission would not have effect till he should take his seat in Council at Calcutta, so 'could only use the opportunity to make himself acquainted with the affairs of that 'perturbed Presidency, where some of the mutineers of Vellore 'were still under sentence awaiting their fate.' He arrived at Calcutta in the latter end of July, the hottest season of the year, during which now-a-days no official, who could possibly avoid it, would make his *début* in that climate. It will be rather surprising to old Indians to find him writing a few weeks later :—

'I have never felt anything here equal to the heat of Bastia, or even Vienna, in summer. These are the most oppressive and most unhealthy weeks in the year—the end of September and beginning of October. Afterwards come four, or sometimes five, delectable months. Barrackpore is really delicious, and takes the sting out of India.'

Lower Bengal, however, is not the hot part of India. To understand what Indian heat means, one must spend the summer in the Punjab or Sind.

Lord Minto found India at peace. The splendid Administration of the Marquis Wellesley, signalised by the overthrow of the kingdom of Mysore, the disruption of the Maratta Empire, and the establishment of British supremacy from Cape Comorin to the Sutlej—the creation, in fact, of British

India as it is at the present day—had terminated about two years previously, when the Government and the Court of Directors, equally alarmed at the continued expenditure involved in Lord Wellesley's policy, recalled him, and sent out the venerable Lord Cornwallis for the second time to assume the government, charged by his instructions to effect peace at any price. Lord Cornwallis died in October, 1805, before the intended pacification had been accomplished, and was succeeded by Sir George Barlow, the senior member of Council, who held a provisional commission as Governor-General, and who carried out only too faithfully the instructions from home, regardless of the fact that those instructions had been issued many months before, and that the subsequent course of events had practically rendered them wholly inapplicable to the actual condition of affairs. Of the three great Mahratta chiefs, the Rajahs of Gwalior and Berar had been already brought to terms, and Holkar, the only adversary still in the field, was a fugitive beyond the Sutlej, with difficulty keeping together a small following of horsemen. It needed only a small persistence for a very short time longer to bring the great Mahratta war to a completely successful conclusion, and to effect the pacification of India on the only basis which admits of lasting tranquillity, the complete and undisputed supremacy of British authority. But a spirit of blind and unreasoning panic was now predominant in our councils. Our victorious army was withdrawn from the pursuit of Holkar, and a peace hastily patched up with him. The Mahratta Confederacy and the different States of Central India were left to themselves, and our faithful allies, the Rajput princes, our protection withdrawn, were abandoned to the mercy of their enemies. During the government of Lord Minto this peace was not disturbed. The native States of Central India remained for a season in the quietude of exhaustion, and the final overthrow of the Mahratta Confederacy and the subjugation of the robber hordes of Central India were tasks reserved for his successor. Lord Minto meanwhile was able to apply himself mainly to the business of internal administration, to restoring the finances, and to bringing the military strength of India to bear on the great struggle with Napoleon, then being carried on over the whole civilised globe.

The first impressions of India upon so acute an observer and so delightful a letter-writer are all full of interest, and are given at length, as might be expected. Two things seem to have particularly impressed Lord Minto at first—the discomfort of his state and the amount of work to be done by him:—

'I drive out almost every morning and evening. The formality of these airings is uncomfortable to me to a degree that I cannot at all accustom myself to. I am always followed by an officer and six troopers of the body-guard. . . . Four syces, or horse-keepers, with fly-flappers, ran alongside of the horses, till I positively rebelled against this annoyance. Everybody, native and European, salaams as I pass, and the natives, who swarm, draw up in lines and touch the ground almost with their heads. The consequence is that my right hand is never away from my head. I have had thoughts of sticking a wax hand in my hat. It is still worse with a palanquin. Thirty people go before in two lines. . . . They carry gold and silver maces and halberds, and embroidered fans, and cows' tails to keep off the flies. Even at home there was no escape from the annoyance. The first night I went to bed at Calcutta I was followed by fourteen persons in white muslin gowns into the dressing-room. One might have hoped that some of them were ladies; but on finding that there were as many turbans and black beards as gowns, I was very desirous that these bearded handmaids should leave me to single Tom, which with some trouble and perseverance I accomplished, and in that one room I enjoy a degree of privacy, but far from perfect.'

As to work :—

'The situation of public affairs is peculiarly favourable to the circumstances in which I am placed. There is really nothing of great moment depending, and nothing stirring in the great scale of politics. . . . I have time, therefore, to form my views at leisure. But the principal grievance I have to complain of is that the quantity and quick succession of current business is such as to employ every instant I can command from ceremony, and the interruption of private solicitation, without affording any time for reading back, or looking forward, or acquiring general information. . . . The number and variety of affairs is also immense; for everything, small as well as great, must have the sanction of Government, and instead of being transacted by the secretaries, as in England, must be actually stated, and the orders given in Council. A declaration of war, and an estimate for an addition to a barrack a thousand miles off, may come next to each other in the secretaries' bundle. . . . The secretaries attend at council, each department in its turn with its mountain of bundles. The secretary reads . . . and the order is given on the spot. We are enabled to do this by having read these bundles at home. Now, our secretaries are all modest men, who scarcely read above their breath. It is a constant strain of the ear to hear them; the business is often of the heaviest and dullest kind, the voices monotonous, and, as one small concern succeeds another, the punkah vibrates gently over my eyes; and in this warm atmosphere the whole operation has been found somewhat composing. It is often a vehement struggle to avoid a deleterious oblivious wink. But if the sovereign nods, the empire must fall to pieces; the fear of which has hitherto kept my fond eyelids from kissing each other, but not from most loving dispositions.'

The degree of Oriental state here described has no doubt been greatly reduced, although no great official in the East can escape from it wholly, least of all a Governor-General. The mode of conducting business has also been greatly simplified and expedited from the time when everything was referred to the Governor-General and discussed and settled over the council table. Papers on which orders in Council are passed are now only 'read' in the same sense that a bill is read in Parliament; and under the departmental system introduced by Lord Canning, under which each member of the Council takes charge of a separate department, the mode of conducting the business of government now resembles that in use in England and other countries governed by collective ministries, and only large matters come before the whole Council. Only in this way would it have been possible to keep abreast with the ever-increasing business of the Indian Government. Necessity has led to simplification and the substitution of individual for collective responsibility. When Lord Wellesley went to India, he found the Council not only exercising the functions of the Executive Government, but sitting also as the chief court of appellate civil and criminal jurisdiction. Since then the means have been gradually adjusted to the ends. In Madras, where the machinery of government is far in excess of the wants of a single province, the old plan of transacting business by the collective Council is still maintained, in order to find employment for the councillors. But no change in the direction of simplifying the mode of conducting the business of the Supreme Government was made in Lord Minto's time, nor indeed until long afterwards. As his term of office went on, Lord Minto complained more and more of the pressure of work, and that he used to find himself quite exhausted by the end of each day's labour. The experience of Lord Dalhousie and Lord Canning was to the same effect, and the burden is not likely to decrease. The Governor-General of India must always be one of the most overworked of her Majesty's subjects.

The first great measure which it devolved on Lord Minto to take was for counteracting French influence in Persia. 'In January, 1808, rumours reached India of the march of a French army towards Persia, on the way to India, while it became known that a great military embassy, attended by four-and-twenty French officers and 300 French soldiers, had actually arrived there, giving it out that they were the advanced guard of an army.' Their project, wrote Lord Minto to his wife, was believed in India to be to take pos-

session of a port on the Persian Gulf, by which to communicate with the Mauritius, 'and from whence they may attempt an invasion of the western coast of India, and unsettle the minds of the native princes by promises, menaces, and intrigue.' Sir Harford Jones was understood to have been appointed ambassador to Persia by the British Government, but the Indian authorities had no confidence in his abilities, and nothing was known to them of his movements. Further rumours, which were believed in by the home authorities, reached India of a contemplated invasion of that country by a Russian army, under a secret article of agreement made with France at the peace of Tilsit; and further, that Napoleon was contemplating a seizure of Turkey as a first step towards India. The way was long, but in those days, after the astonishing successes already achieved, nothing seemed impossible to Napoleon, who was then in the zenith of his power and conquests. As was observed by a young writer quoted by Lady Minto, destined to become himself Governor-General, and to win a peerage by his services—the late Lord Metcalfe, then only nineteen years of age—'What an unexampled and surprising picture the state of Europe now presents! France, Russia, Austria, Prussia, Germany, Holland, Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Italy, Turkey—all Europe, save little Sweden—combined against our country. We may truly call ourselves *divisos orbe Britannos*. Although this is a state of things which no one could have wished to see, I confess that I feel a pride in it. . . . We have constantly fought the battles of Europe against France, and all Powers are now ranged on the side of France against us. Hurrah for the tight little island!' In these days, when people talk and write about every petty skirmish that goes against us, as if we had lost a Hohenlinden or a Marengo, and every little reverse is treated as if foreshadowing the collapse of the Empire, it is a good form of political tonic to look back on the cheery spirit with which our countrymen at the beginning of the century faced undismayed the tremendous combinations against them. Among the public men of the time no one had contended more consistently than Lord Minto for maintaining a steady opposition to the overweening ambition of Napoleon. But he thoroughly believed in the possibility of an invasion of India, and, without waiting for instructions from home, he set himself actively to the work of anticipating the designs of our great enemy by meeting him beyond the frontier. 'I am strongly of opinion,' he writes to his predecessor, Sir George Barlow, now Governor of Madras, 'that, if this great conflict

'is to be maintained, we ought to meet it as early and as far beyond our own frontiers as possible. We ought to contest Persia itself with the enemy, and to dispute every step of their progress.' And, in absolute ignorance of Sir Harford Jones's movements, he determined to send Colonel Malcolm on a mission to Persia. Malcolm had once before been employed in this capacity by Lord Wellesley to counteract a threatened invasion of India by the Afghans. 'By Malcolm, if by any man living, we may hope to detach Persia from her hostile alliance with the enemy.'

'Our opposition to France in Persia,' he writes to Malcolm himself, 'is the anchor on which our hopes must rest. . . . My first anxiety, therefore, will be to know from you whether the disposition of the Persian Court or the state of that country admits of our meeting the enemy at the very moment of his arrival or approach to the Persian frontier. . . . I shall in the meantime make every effort which the state of our resources admits of, to be prepared with an army and the means of transporting it. In the meanwhile I have imagined that a force of 20,000 or 25,000 men may be necessary. This will be a great exertion, and I don't think that we can go further.'

But Lord Minto's confidence in Malcolm was entirely misplaced. His mission failed. He led off in a domineering style, claiming concessions as a right, and endeavouring to work on the fears of the Persian Government, which was already too much under the influence of France to be susceptible to such a form of argument. Malcolm retired discomfited, and Sir Harford Jones appearing on the scene was able to negotiate a treaty of peace between Persia and England, in which, however, the Indian Government was practically ignored. Lord Minto did not hesitate to ratify the treaty, knowing that the public faith of England was thereby engaged, but he sent instructions to Persia disavowing the public character of the ambassador, and desiring him to quit Persia immediately, on pain of having his bills dishonoured; and he recorded a strong protest against the establishment of our Embassy to Persia on a footing of independence of the Indian Government, by which alone, he considered, our affairs in Asia could properly be regulated. His opinion, however, was overruled. Sir Gore Ouseley, who was appointed to succeed Sir Harford Jones, was put directly under the Foreign Office, and this arrangement has since then always been maintained.

Two other allies besides the Persians Lord Minto was bent on securing—the ruler of the Sikhs and the King of Cabul. For the purpose of gaining the former, young Metcalfe, then only twenty-three years old, but who had already shown

his ability and judgment while serving as a political officer in Lord Lake's camp, was selected as Envoy. The position was a difficult one, for the Sikh ruler, Runjît Singh, was bent on annexing the small Sikh independent states lying between the Sutlej and the Jumna, immediately beyond our frontier, which were deemed to be under our protection; and Metcalfe more than once was on the point of breaking off negotiations. But his tact and temper and determination prevailed at last; and although, while Metcalfe was conducting his protracted affairs with the crafty Runjît, the tidings came from Europe that the arch-disturber of the world's peace had turned his thoughts from Asiatic conquests to others nearer home, and that an invasion of India was no longer to be dreaded, so that it was no longer necessary to carry out a great scheme of defensive alliances beyond the British territories, the opportunity was taken to negotiate a treaty of general amity with the Sikh ruler, which in effect lasted until the revolutions which followed on the death of Runjît, nearly forty years afterwards.

Another great mission was sent to the King of Cabul, conducted by the eminent Mountstuart Elphinstone. The history of this mission has already been given in the gifted Envoy's own narrative, and therefore need not be more than touched upon here. Before Elphinstone had completed his hazardous journey through regions then unknown to Europeans, the outbreak of the Spanish war and the prospect of renewed hostilities between France and Austria had diverted attention from Eastern invasions, and the Indian Government had no longer a keen interest in entering into binding treaties with so distant a power as Afghanistan. But we cannot refrain from quoting the suggestive paragraph wherein Mr. Elphinstone, while deprecating any scheme of sending an army to Cabul as impracticable at that time, adds that

'it is very much to be wished that it were practicable for us to contribute more directly to prevent that country from *falling into the hands of the French*; for if they were once in possession of it, their invasion of our territories would be no longer a great and desperate enterprise, but an attempt which they might make without risk when they pleased, and repeat whenever the state of our affairs gave a prospect of success.'

At the present time this extract has a curious significance. *Tempora mutantur, non nos mutamur in illis.*

Meanwhile the course of Indian administration proceeded busily. The country was at peace, although, as the editor observes, that word must be taken in a relative sense, 'for in India the public peace was kept by armies,' and with our

territories bordered by a line of independent native states governed by princes in different stages of civilisation, and always ready to create disturbance, there was of necessity almost constant need for military operations, generally on a small scale only, but occasionally involving hard work and even hard fighting. The state of anarchy which led to the Pindari war was evidently working up even then, but the Indian Government, still under the influence of the non-intervention policy so strongly inculcated from home, had not yet been forced into larger measures for keeping the peace throughout the country. But even in Bengal domestic quiet was not always secure ; ' it was with equal surprise and dismay that it was found necessary, in the course of 1809, to employ the regular forces to extirpate the gangs of banditti, or dacoits, who had penetrated into the heart of the Presidency, and with whom the native police were accused of being in league.' ' They have of late,' writes Lord Minto, ' come within thirty miles of Barrackpore.' These dacoits

' have established a terrorism as perfect as that which was the foundation of the French Republican power . . . while the real Government did not possess either authority or influence enough to obtain from the people the smallest aid towards their own protection. If a whole village was destroyed, not a man was found to complain. If a family was half murdered and half tortured, the tortured survivors could not be prevailed upon to appear against the criminals. Men have been found with their limbs and half the flesh of their bodies consumed by a slow fire, who persisted in saying that they had fallen into their own fire, or otherwise denying all knowledge of the event that could tend to the conviction or detection of the offenders.'

This crime of dacoity was not wholly extirpated until the time of Lord Dalhousie ; but in making up their debtor and creditor account of the benefits, or otherwise, accruing to them from English rule, no doubt the people of India will forget the horrible outrages that used to be committed, not only by Pindaris and Mahrattas, but by the rougher classes in all parts, on their offending fellow-countrymen. In truth, it is simply absurd to make a serious comparison between the present and former condition of India, or the relative degrees of happiness and prosperity enjoyed in old and recent times ; but gratitude is the last quality which we must expect to see manifested in public, by nations any more than individuals, and governments, like private persons, must be satisfied to do their duty without expecting other reward than that derived from the consciousness of having performed it. It is the fashion now-a-days not only for the Indians but the English to lose sight of the enormous

benefits which our countrymen in the East have conferred upon the people of India, and to dwell only on the inevitable disadvantages attending foreign rule. As regarded the growing troubles from the lawless condition manifested beyond the frontier, Lord Minto put it to the Home Government whether it was expedient to continue 'to observe a strict neutrality amidst ' the scenes of disorder and outrage which were passing under ' our eyes in the north of Hindustan, or whether we should ' listen to the calls of suffering humanity, and interfere for the ' protection of those weak and defenceless states who implore ' our assistance, to deliver them from the violence of an ambitious and lawless upstart.' And the Home Government was now forced to admit that the policy of non-intervention so strictly enjoined on the successors of Lord Wellesley had been carried too far. Their reply, as Lady Minto observes, was 'an instructive commentary on Talleyrand's celebrated reply to one who ' asked him the meaning of the term "non-intervention;" ' "c'est un mot politique et métaphysique qui veut dire à-peu- ' "près la même chose qu'intervention." The most complete justification of Lord Wellesley's policy was indeed furnished by the Mahratta war, which it fell to Lord Minto's successor to undertake and carry to a successful conclusion.

The next great business which Lord Minto had to deal with was the mutiny of the Madras army—not the Sepoys, but their European officers. It arose in the first instance out of the Madras Government abolishing, under orders from home, a vicious contract allowance drawn by commanding officers. The resolution to abolish the contract was arrived at by Lord William Bentinck, when Governor, with the concurrence of the local Commander-in-Chief, Sir John Cradock. But it fell to Sir George Barlow, who for his long services as a councillor in Bengal under Lord Wellesley, and as acting Governor-General, had lately succeeded to the Governorship of Madras, to carry out the order. The Quartermaster-General of the Madras army having stated in his report—which led to the abolition of the contract allowance—that its effect was to place the interest and the duty of commanding officers in opposition to each other, the officers thereon called on the new Commander-in-Chief, General M'Dowell—who had succeeded Sir John Cradock, and was aggrieved at not having been also appointed, as was usual, to a seat in the local Council—to bring the Quartermaster-General to a court-martial for aspersions on their character as officers and gentlemen. M'Dowell, responding to the appeal, at once placed the Quartermaster-General in arrest. The Governor in Council immediately

ordered his release, whereupon the Commander-in-Chief—who was on the point of resigning his office—published a violent manifesto to the army, which was immediately responded to by an intemperate order from the Government, coupled with the dismissal of two officers of high rank, who had countersigned and published the order of their superior. ‘The battle was then joined.’ The Madras Government had of course the right entirely on their side, and the officers and the chief were entirely in the wrong, but the Governor and his Council nevertheless showed a great want of temper and judgment in dealing with the monstrous pretensions of the officers. And when soon afterwards four commanding officers were removed and eight others suspended, ‘the scarcely smothered flames of disaffection burst out with renewed fierceness;’ the European officers broke out into what in effect was open mutiny. Malcolm, who had been sent by the Madras Government on a mission to Masulipatam, reported that ‘there was not a Company’s corps from Cape Comorin to Ganjam that was not implicated in the general guilt—that is not pledged to rise against the Government unless what they call their grievances are redressed.’ Plans were formed for concentrating the rebel force and marching on Madras, the officers taking for granted that they would be followed in their mutiny by the native soldiery. Eventually, by the firmness of Sir George Barlow, who was quite prepared if necessary to employ the King’s troops against the mutineers, and also took measures to detach the Sepoys from the cause of their officers, the would-be insurgents were reduced to submission without either concession or an appeal to arms. As soon as the news of the revolt at Masulipatam reached Lord Minto, he set off for Madras, but the voyage was a long one, and before he arrived the crisis was at an end. Desiring to weaken as little as possible the authority of the Government of Madras, he announced his intention to interfere in no degree in its affairs generally; but while continuing to support the authority of Sir George Barlow, as he had done from the first, he felt that he should discharge imperfectly the extraordinary powers entrusted to him if he contented himself with professing a blind concurrence in counsels over which he had come to preside. He determined therefore ‘to pursue a personal investigation of the facts, followed by a mature deliberation on their results, before committing himself to any of the principal points depending.’ Accordingly, after most searching enquiry, he issued a general order, which ‘stated in clear but most moderate terms the offence against the just authority of Govern-

‘ment, of which the coast army had been guilty, and then ‘proceeded to make a selection of the offenders for punishment.’ A number of senior officers, not exceeding twenty-one, were to be sent to trial by court-martial; others, who had been distinguished for a forward part in the proceedings, were to take their option of trial or dismissal from the service:—

‘To the rest of the army a general and unqualified amnesty was granted. The language of this general order admirably reflected the spirit of its author. It was at once firm and generous. While it demonstrated the Governor-General’s determination to do no more than was necessary for the vindication of justice, it firmly reasserted the principles of military subordination to legal authority . . . and it did not shrink from a tribute to Sir George Barlow, to whose firmness and energy it was due that a monstrous conflict had been avoided between the coast army and their country. “I entreat the officers,” it said in conclusion, “to be persuaded that no man of honour at the head of a “government will ever compromise revolt, and that in every case the “conflict must be carried to the last extremity. . . . My fixed and “firm principle is that the utmost evils that can flow from a contest “with revolt, and even from defeat, are much inferior to the greater, ‘more permanent, and more extensive mischief of concession. In ‘such cases the revolted party may recede, and will always do so with ‘honour, sacrificing nothing but passions and crimes. The Govern-‘ment against which the revolt is made has no option but to maintain ‘the contest or abandon its trust and fly its duty.”’

Never did Lord Minto’s strength of character and good judgment shine out more conspicuously than in his dealings with this case. As he observes himself, in a letter to the Commander-in-Chief in Bengal, whom he had sent for to take his place when returning himself back to Bengal, ‘the art of ‘government consists in distinguishing between the course ‘which is suited to extraordinary conjunctures, and the permanent policy by which men are to be governed.’ Seen by present lights, it might appear that Lord Minto erred on the side of leniency, and no doubt many of the officers, including General M^cDowell, richly deserved to be shot; but the very fact that the officers should have conceived the possibility of their conduct being justified shows that the matter could only be properly judged by a comparatively low standard. And it must be remembered, in mitigation of the officers’ crime, that there was practically no appeal to Parliament if the officers had a grievance against their masters, the Court of Directors, towards whom it was in the nature of things impossible to feel in any high degree the sentiment of loyalty.

Lord Minto remained at Madras for fourteen months. As might have been expected from the composition of the Court

of Directors, many of whom had themselves belonged to the Indian service in its worst days, there was a great division of opinion on the case at the East India House. Some of the directors were friendly to Sir George Barlow, and others hostile, while many were closely connected in relationship with the officers of the mutinous army. 'A violent controversy arose upon the general policy which had been observed towards the rebellious army. Some blamed it as too severe, some as having unduly slackened the reins of authority.' Unfortunately there was then no one at home with any military weight to pronounce authoritatively on the matter. 'It was no doubt due to the dissensions on the subject in the Court of Directors that Lord Minto was left without any official statement of their opinions on these weighty matters for more than two years after they took place.'

While at Madras the marriage took place of Lord Minto's third son, a young civilian attached to his household—an arrangement which, besides being a very happy arrangement for the principals, greatly contributed to the cheerfulness and comfort of Lord Minto's Indian life. He was fortunate, too, in having with him his second son, whose frigate was kept on the Indian station. Nevertheless he now began to be very homesick.

'My domestic longings,' he wrote to his wife in the end of 1809, 'are becoming every month more importunate and unreasonable. I first determined not to reckon for many years to come, well knowing that the hours of expectation would not be made fewer by any sort of computation I could contrive, but that they would be much increased in length and retarded in velocity. Then I compromised for quarters of a year. Then it came to months, and now I grieve to say that I am actually counting days with all the exactness of a clock. The days are innumerable indeed, yet, being a good arithmetician, I actually know their number. . . . It would be a great joy to skip a day, but that never happens. . . . One of my common vigils is performing the voyage home, and the journey from one well-known sign-post to another, from the Red Lion, Barnet, to Minto. As I have a perfectly fair wind, and plenty of it all the way to Portsmouth, and good horses and roads to Minto, I meet with no let or hindrance till I come to the Lower Lodge.'

Soon afterwards the naval son also married in Calcutta, and was established for a time at Government House. Writing to his wife of the comfort afforded by the presence of his two daughters-in-law, whose beauty was the reigning theme, he adds:—

'I have occasion for all the comforts I can snatch; for my work is
VOL. CLI. NO. CCCIX. R

hard and fatigues both body and spirit, not by bodily exercise, but by the effect of mental labour on a body entirely at rest. I am as entirely done up by ten o'clock as if I had been all day on the moors, and I am in general too much overworked to be frosty-mornish. However, I have a good quiet sort of contentedness, and spectator-like enjoyment of all the happiness about me, which serves 'my turn. A few gulps of colder air down our strath will make me too young and oppressive for the best nerves among you.'

The next great business which occupied Lord Minto was the capture of Bourbon and the Mauritius. All fear of an invasion of India had now gone by, for Napoleon had too much on his hands nearer home; but as a secure harbour for French privateers these islands were perpetual sources of annoyance. Lord Wellesley had contemplated sending an expedition for their capture, and would probably not have been restrained by the orders of the Home Government interdicting such enterprises; but during the latter part of his term of office himself and the Indian armies were too busily engaged to undertake it. The annoyance was perhaps the more keenly felt now that all notion of larger operations against India was no longer feared, and that the sea had been cleared of French fleets. In 1809 no fewer than six Indiamen were taken on their voyage in the Bay of Bengal by the enemy's cruisers which found a shelter in the Mauritius, and in the following year Lord Minto set about the conquest of these islands. They had been for some time blockaded by a squadron, and the small island of Rodrigues, to the eastward of them, had been occupied by a detachment of troops from Bombay, as a depot for supplying water and refreshments to the blockading squadron. Two captured Indiamen having been taken into Port St. Paul, in the island of Bourbon, Commodore Rowley, the naval commander, with the aid of Lieutenant-Colonel Keatinge, the military commandant of Rodrigues, attacked and carried this port, and thereon asked that a reinforcement of about 2,000 men should be sent from India, with which they were confident of reducing the whole island. The expedition was accordingly sent, but in greater strength than was asked for, 'in order,' said the Governor-General, 'to provide against the preparation for defence which may have been made since the attack on Port St. Paul.' A still larger force was made ready to follow, in view to the capture of the Mauritius. The Governor-General applied himself to the supervision of the undertaking with his accustomed vigour. His good judgment and strength of character were characteristically displayed in his determination to make the attack at once, although the

season was unfavourable and time pressed, instead of waiting till the following year.

‘I have been pretty nearly alone,’ he writes, ‘in thinking it practicable to make the attempt before next April, a delay which might probably be fatal to the ultimate success. If the troops do not rendezvous off the island in time to attack by the middle of November, it is not entirely prudent to attempt it later, for the violent hurricanes which seem to live in these islands and to come out, like swallows, at certain seasons, sometimes are experienced in the course of November, though seldom before the middle of December. . . . Although it would be hazardous to keep a fleet of transports exposed to these birds of prey, or to land troops at a time when their ships and stores may be blown off or *worse*, yet single ships or more, which have a port to come to, may run in and bring succours during the tempestuous season, without greater hazard than the object deserved. The French accordingly employ the hurricane months, and the most positive assurances have been given to the Governor of the Isle of France that troops, military stores, and all the means of defence shall be despatched from Europe this very season. It is of great consequence, therefore, that *we* should be at Port Louis to receive such supplies from France, rather than Monsieur de Caen. This is one of several reasons, and certainly the strongest, which has made me *damnatus obstinatus mulier* (vide Cowslip’s translation), and determined me to push off the expedition now, whether it was possible or not. The weight of opinion was strong against me in all quarters, but when once the point was decided, all hands concurred lustily in the execution, and lo and behold! everything is actually afloat.’

The complete success of the expedition is matter of history. A month after it had sailed from India, instructions were received from home recommending the measure, which—wrote Lord Minto—‘a strong sense of duty’ to the public had induced him to adopt under a heavy responsibility.

These islands captured, Lord Minto at once set about the conquest of Java, ‘which will fill up the whole scheme of my ‘warlike purposes, and which will purge the eastern side of ‘the globe of every hostile or rival European establishment.’ And in order to ensure the success of the expedition, he took the public-spirited course of going with it himself.

‘My going in person upon this service,’ he writes to his wife, ‘is not a very usual measure, and, my motives not being generally understood, many ingenious conjectures are, as usual, in circulation. . . . My own reasons are that there are many important points regarding our future relations with the Dutch, and with the native states of Java, which ought to be adjusted at the moment of attack; that it is impossible to obtain at this distance the information and materials on which a satisfactory judgment can be formed, and which should enable me to issue instructions sufficiently distinct or well-founded to meet all

possible exigencies. . . . Events might require modifications not to be foreseen or provided for; and, lastly, that, as Admiral Drury acts under a distinct authority and is fond of acting for himself, I have no security for the execution of any plan I might adopt, or any instructions which might be given by this Government. . . . It is not matter of taste or choice, but of necessity, that I am going to friskify in this manner, although I confess, since it is right, that I never engaged in any affair with greater interest or with more pleasure; and you will easily conceive what a gratifying break this kind of adventure must be in the monotony of my not less laborious life at Fort William.'

He made his head-quarters on board the 'Modeste' frigate, commanded by his son George, and was accompanied by John, the civilian and private secretary, also by the distinguished Leyden, of whom he remarks that

'Dr. Leyden's learning is stupendous, and he is a very universal scholar. His knowledge, extensive and minute as it is, is always in his pocket, at his fingers' ends, and on the tip of his tongue. He has made it completely his own, and it is all ready money. . . . It must be confessed that Leyden has occasion for all the stores which application and memory can furnish to supply his tongue, which would dissipate a common stock in a week. I do not believe so great a reader was ever so great a talker before. . . . You . . . my beautiful wife and daughters, would appear absolutely silent in his company, as a ship under way seems at anchor when it is passed by a swifter sailer.'

Touching at Penang, the 'Modeste' reached Malacca, the point of rendezvous for the expedition, where the Bengal portion of the troops were already arrived and comfortably encamped on the beach. A very graphic and interesting account of the voyage down and of the country is given in Lord Minto's letters, which we have not space to quote from, but an extract must be given from the amusing autobiography of a Malay—Abdulla by name—the translation of which has been lately published, and which is cited by the editor of this work. After describing the arrival of the great fleet of ninety sail, which must have presented a very imposing as well as beautiful appearance, with the background of these lovely coasts, Abdulla says:—

'When at last came the ship with Lord Minto on board, there went out an order for everyone to clean their frontages in all the streets. Then thousands of all races collected at the sea shore to have a sight of him and his dress, his name being so great. . . . And when I had seen the appearance and circumstance of Lord Minto, I was much moved; for I guessed in my mind, as to his appearance, position, and height, that these would be great, and his dress gorgeous. . . . But his appearance was of one which was middle-aged, thin in body, of

soft manners and sweet countenance, and I felt that he could not carry twenty cutties (about thirty pounds), so slow were his motions. His dress coat was black cloth, trousers the same, nor was there anything peculiar. . . . Now he had not the remotest appearance of pomposity or lofty-headedness, but there was real modesty and kindly expression.'

The great flotilla, having reached Malacca in safety, set out again for its final destination in detachments, each convoyed by a frigate, the navigation being difficult and wind contrary. At this season of the year the south-east monsoon blows right in the teeth of the course which they had to make, and the commodore, who had little of the spirit for which our naval officers at that time were so conspicuous, would have it that the expedition had started from India too late in the season to accomplish its purpose of making Java. And indeed, as Lord Minto observes in a letter to his wife, 'to carry a great fleet of transports, not famous in general for working to windward, a long voyage, directly against wind and tide, did not appear promising.' It was argued, however, by other advisers—the captain of the 'Modeste' being probably among the number—that, with the help of squalls and occasional shifts of wind and alterations of tide and current, vessels might work across from the mouth of the Straits of Malacca to the coast of Borneo, and thence with an easterly wind stand across to Java on the south. This plan was agreed to, the commodore, 'who is the most cautious navigator that ever wore a blue coat,' having appropriately selected the frigate which carried the Governor-General to go ahead and reconnoitre the channel, 'thinking very probably,' said the latter, 'that I had better be drowned than he. As I was of the same opinion, I accepted the service very thankfully.' Piloted accordingly by the 'Modeste,' the great fleet made the passage safely, and arrived in Batavia Bay on July 30, 1811. The disembarkation began immediately. The enemy, who had between 6,000 and 7,000 troops, was driven on August 10 from his first entrenched position with inconsiderable loss, which gave our troops possession of Batavia, and on the 26th the enemy's works were carried by assault in a very gallant manner, after a sharp struggle and with heavy loss, and the greater part of their troops made prisoners. The fugitive remainder had no means of prolonging the resistance in other parts of the island, and Java was finally surrendered by capitulation in the following month. Thus the object of the expedition had been accomplished in a thoroughly successful and brilliant way; and if the circumstances of the times be considered, and the means available, the

great distance from India which had to be traversed, the large scale on which the operation had to be framed, and the difficulty of navigating these seas in sailing vessels, it must be admitted that to organise and carry out such an expedition was a remarkable feat. We may readily believe that this success was due in large measure to the presence of the head of the Government, and to the energy, wisdom, and firmness, tempered with humour and kindly consideration for all under him, which he brought to the task. Yet in his amusing and modest letters to his wife but little mention is made of the difficulties he must have had to contend against in the superintendence of so great an undertaking, and the vast amount of labour it must have involved; or, if he does allude to these things, it is in a light and playful way. Lord Minto had the faculty of bearing his burden easily. What is even more difficult, he could put up equably with neglect and non-recognition of his services. Writing from Java in October, just after the capitulation, he observes that no one could have supposed from the English papers just to hand that he had any concern with the conquest of the French islands beyond the execution of an order sent out from home—the fact being that the order was not received in Calcutta till the troops had already arrived at their destination. So also every preparation had been made to attack Java as soon as the success of the expedition to the Mauritius was assured, and the expedition would have sailed even if no orders had been received from home for undertaking it. Not that the Government could well have sent their orders sooner than they did, but circumstances of which he took advantage favoured earlier action than the Home Government were prepared for.

Lord Minto found Java a much more valuable island than he had been led to expect; moreover, he did not see the way to carry out the orders of the Court of Directors to expel the Dutch, destroy the fortifications, and distribute the captured arms and stores among the native population. These instructions, therefore, he took upon himself to disobey. To act on them would have been to give up a rich and prosperous country to anarchy, with its attendant pillage and massacre. In his view only three courses were open: to withdraw the defenceless European population, which would have involved supporting them into the bargain; to restore the colony unweakened to the Dutch; or to retain it under the British Government. He determined on the last course; the Dutch were friendly, being generally repugnant to the French usurpation; whereas, had they been apprised of our intention to deliver them up dis-

armed to the Javanese, the invaders would have had to contend with all the energies of despair, and the British force would have been found quite inadequate to the enterprise. Java was accordingly held by the English until it was restored to Holland at the peace, and under Mr. Raffles, the governor placed in charge by Lord Minto, the island achieved even in these few years a considerable advance in prosperity.

Returning to Calcutta, it was with no small share of surprise Lord Minto found that the heavy mail-bags which had accumulated during his long absence were absolutely silent regarding the most important transactions of the preceding years, 'namely, the Madras mutiny and the conquest of the 'French islands.' 'I have not been able sometimes to help asking myself,' he wrote to Lord Melville, then at the Board of Control, 'whether the same silence would have prevailed if 'I had failed.' Lord Minto, however, was accustomed to official neglect of this sort. After he had taken possession of Corsica in the name of Great Britain, he remained for months without any acknowledgment of his proceedings from the Government. The Duke of Portland, one of the most thoroughly incompetent men who ever held high office, and who would have found it difficult to earn a livelihood in any other capacity than that of a duke, was the responsible Secretary of State at the time, a man who never could be got to make up his mind even to the point of writing a letter; and when Lord Minto returned to England he found some of his despatches from Corsica lying on the Duke's table with the seals unbroken. Things were almost as bad now. Writing to the chairman of the Court of Directors, he says: 'In the last 'days of 1811 I have still to say that I do not know by a 'single official word that my residence at Madras during eight 'months of the years 1809 and 1810 has ever reached the 'ears of the Court of Directors. I hazarded from thence 'several important suggestions for the public good, but they 'have lain without notice until the present time.' The reason for this silence was, as has been already mentioned, that 'the 'Court of Directors was a house divided against itself.' Some passages in a letter from his daughter give an amusing and probably an accurate explanation of the causes which tended to deprive her father's services at this period of proper recognition.

'There is such a complication of plots and wheels in the political world that it is not very easy to say at any time what will be thought or done by those who call themselves your friends. I believe that if the present Government brought forward any proposal of rewarding

you, or Sir George either, for the Madras business, or had even voted thanks for the Isle of France, Opposition would, as in duty bound, have opposed the measure; and the directors, amidst all the variances in their court on all the late Indian business, may think, like Mrs. Beaumont in "*Manœuvring*," that *in general it is safest not to mention things*. As for the Isle of France, they wish it had been taken for them, instead of the Crown. . . . Lord Grenville, &c., think, I suppose, that it might have been done during their administration (as Lord Wellesley knows he might have done it). And while in their eyes your measures are those of the present Ministry, and your honour and glory theirs, consequently not to be promoted, in the eyes of said ministers you are an Oppositionist, and equally an unfit person to be exalted by their approbation. The great men of the age are certainly not governed by great motives.'

Lord Holland writes :—

'Whatever indifference may have been shown to events in India, has been extended also to the war in Spain, the concerns of the north of Europe, the orders in council at home, and the events in America; for while the various negotiations for forming a Ministry were pending, it is true that they so entirely engrossed all the attention of the public that victories and defeats, peaces and wars, insurrections and scarcities were overlooked as matters of inferior importance; and a newspaper which contained nothing but extraordinary gazettes, and no minute of a conversation between private gentlemen on their views of policy or party connexions, was a dull, insipid, and uninteresting production.'

Lord Holland was perhaps hardly the person to form an impartial judgment on the ministry of the day, but the more we learn about the secret history of those times the more plainly does the incompetency stand out of the men who after the death of Pitt carried the great struggle to a successful conclusion. One at least of the advantages attending the greater publicity under which the business of the nation is now carried on is that it is impossible for any Government to ignore the merits of a distinguished public servant. It was not until 1812, when Lord Liverpool succeeded to the head of the Government on the death of Mr. Percival, that Lord Minto received what he terms a full and handsome acknowledgment of his services with regard to all the conquests in which he had had a share, as well as of the merits of his general administration.

Lord Minto returned to Calcutta from Java towards the end of 1811. The two years which ensued were not marked by any such acts as signalised the earlier part of his administration, although they were fully occupied by many measures of importance—and when, indeed, will a Governor-General of India not find business of importance to occupy him?—but as

he makes but little reference to them in his private correspondence, with which this volume is mainly concerned, his biographer does not enter into them. Meanwhile Lord Minto's letters home became shorter, and contained smaller reference than before to public business, because he was now feeling the effects of overwork. As he explains it himself:—

‘I feel anxious to tell you why, with the same good intentions, I have fallen short so far of my former voluminous virtues in correspondence. One reason is that I have too much to do by several hours' work daily. Our conquests, among other causes, have increased our labours greatly. But since you will know my infirmities, the honest truth is that I am older every birthday, which is very common in the East; and, now-a-days, getting up to open my shop at five or half-past, and slaving like a maid-of-all-work the whole day, I am ashamed to own that between 7 and 8 p.m. I am so thoroughly done up, that I *coup o'er* like a leaden statue, on a sofa set ready in the breezy verandah, and doze, and dream of Minto; but am fairly unable to sit up and write, fighting with the flare and the mosquitoes, as I was wont in my youth, a year or two ago. This is the melancholy truth.’

The biographer adds that ‘after his return from Java a perceptible change came over the tone of his letters. Passages in the minor key predominate. The expressions of love and longing for home, frequent enough before, became almost painful in their repetition and intensity.’ The death of his youngest son (also, like the second son, a sailor), and of his dearest friend Windham, ‘had cast their shadow over the past and the future.’ He was wont to say that no grief should be indulged at the cost of duties to the living, or to the exclusion of a thankful acknowledgment of past happiness or of blessings untouched; and he did his best to act up to his professions. But, as he wrote to his wife, ‘though their names may be seldom on my lips, their memory will be ever present to me;’ and again of his long intimacy with Windham: ‘The earliest fruit of friendship's tree is the sweetest, and the latest in rotting; but of it there is no second crop.’ But, like all wise public men, Lord Minto did not allow himself to become a mere official drudge. Business, indeed, will seldom be thoroughly well done by the man who gives all his time to it. His letters are full of the books he is reading; he specifies with glee the stock of books he had taken with him to Java, and the leisure he hoped to get for them on board ship; and in the very letter in which he describes himself as a slave to work, he mentions that he is now reading Middleton's ‘Life of Cicero’ for the third time. And although his thoughts ran so constantly upon home, he made throughout his exile the best of things, and

surrounded himself with as many friends and relations as he could gather together in those distant parts. His two sons and their wives, and the unmarried sisters of one of the latter, his military secretary and handsome and accomplished wife, all shared with him the comfort of Government House, and made a large family circle of pretty women and clever men :—

‘Lord Minto,’ says his biographer, ‘was at his best in private society. In London and at Vienna some of the most brilliant men and women of their time had shared his friendship and met in familiar intercourse under his roof. The volumes of correspondence preserved at Minto testify to the regard in which he was held by friends whose signatures would rejoice the heart of a collector of autographs, and who wrote to him with the sort of easy confidence that can only exist with perfect social equality. At Calcutta he was a big man—bigger by head and shoulders than anyone near him—yet nobody could be more unfeignedly grateful than he when some amiable person ignored the circumstance, nor more happy than when, under the shadow of the banians of Barrackpore, he gathered round him those to whom his public capacity was the least of his merits.’

An interesting testimony to the social qualities of the Governor-General, and the esteem in which he was held, is afforded by the diary of Sir John Malcolm, quoted in Sir John Kaye’s life of that officer, where he says that it had been ‘an equal subject of astonishment and delight to him to find a man, whose life had been passed in all the bustle of public affairs, cherishing local attachments with all the enthusiasm of a country gentleman, and resting his happiness upon the best and truest basis, natural ties, and consequently finding in the constantly increasing affection of his family that which gives success its highest zest, and brings comfort under every reverse of fortune.’

We have not space here to dwell at any length on the various administrative questions with which Lord Minto was called on to deal, but reference must be made to one subject, as illustrating the Governor-General’s wisdom and political courage. The great expenditure and the consequent strain on the finances entailed by Lord Wellesley’s wars—while the returns from the annexations which were one of their results had not yet begun to be realised—had been chief among the reasons for the recall of that statesman. Lord Cornwallis was despatched to India in haste to inaugurate a policy of peace and retrenchment, which his successor, Sir George Barlow, carried out with an inflexibility that refused to make any concession to variations arising in the conditions to be dealt with. It devolved on Lord Minto to pursue the efforts towards economy and retrenchment

begun before his arrival, and strongly urged on him by the authorities at home; but he also found himself at once face to face with the rising spirit of dissatisfaction which had crept over the services under the too rigorous retrenchments to which they had been subjected by his predecessor, while at the same time he received warning that it was in contemplation to send a Commission from England to enquire into the state of the finances and propose further reductions of salaries. To the notion that large savings were to be effected in this way, Lord Minto stoutly opposed himself. 'The two services, civil and military,' he wrote, 'have scarcely had breathing time from an operation precisely similar in its object.' It would be an unwelcome truth at home, but the scale of emolument in force was already lower than was consistent with justice to the Company's service, and with sound policy. The provision of a reasonable scale of emoluments—the work of Lord Cornwallis, who carried out this great reform—had put an end to the system of indirect profits, the speculation and abuse which had been in a manner authorised by the parsimony of the Company in the remuneration of its servants. Any scheme of general retrenchment would have, in his opinion, the immediate effect of countenancing a revival of the abuse. This danger is not one to be feared at the present day. But the remarks which Lord Minto goes on to make as to the ill effect likely to be produced on the temper of the Indian public service 'by frequent and teasing renewals of odious and alarming investigations which seem to leave no man a year's security in the most moderate reward of labour,' are still applicable. 'The diminution of salary,' he goes on to say, 'is not in this country a mere loss of money, but it retards the accomplishment of that wish which is at the bottom of every heart, a return to England.' As to the proposed Commission, he points out, with unalterable force, that 'all schemes of sound economy must be combined with other points of public policy. If simple retrenchment is ordered, without regard to other principles of government,' the effect may be the inefficiency of the whole service:—

'Retrenchment is the specific object of the appointment of a commission. It is in that branch that the public looks for the proofs of their exertion; and the accomplishment of those expectations is to be their title to public notice and approbation on their return to Europe. They are not sent out to govern India. . . . In this respect, therefore, I cannot help thinking a commission of retrenchment is, by its very constitution, subject to the objection of separating those objects of public policy which ought to be combined, and of throwing an extraordinary share of the public authority and energy into a single branch

of the public concerns, in a manner which is distinct from, and is on that account prejudicial to, the general interests of the State. It is in this view that I still consider the established Government of India as the most convenient—I might say, as the only convenient—instrument of such economical reforms as the present conjuncture of the Company's concerns may require.'

The proposal to send out a Finance Commission was not pursued at the time, but similar schemes have been put forward at different times subsequently in times of financial difficulty, and to those who bring them forward Lord Minto's argument is a complete reply. It is worth noticing that from the time of Burke to the present day, there have never been wanting public men to declare that the particular period at which they themselves had come before the public was that when the Indian finances were on the point of collapsing, and that nothing but a wholesale reorganisation of the system of Indian administration, on lines marked out by themselves, will suffice to save it from ruin. But these denunciations, although creating much apprehension at the time, are speedily forgotten as each decade finds India more wealthy and prosperous than in the preceding one.

Lord Minto disposed also very completely of the proposal brought forward by the Court of Directors for restoring the balance of power among the States of India, a balance which Lord Wellesley's conquests had of course completely upset, but after which many of the old school of Indian politicians, unable to appreciate the irrevocable course of events, were still hankering.

'The advantages of a balance of power,' said Lord Minto, 'everyone must agree to as an abstract proposition. But then it must arise out of a consentaneous submission to a system of public law, and a recognition of reciprocal rights. At no period of the history of India do we discover the existence of any such condition as admits of the balance of power being maintained. Among the States of India war, rapine, and conquest constitute an avowed and legitimate pursuit, sanctioned and even recommended by the ordinances of religion, and prosecuted without the semblance or pretext of justice, with a savage disregard of every obligation of humanity and public faith, and restrained alone by the power of resistance.'

There could be only one way of securing peace and quietude throughout India, and that was by maintaining the absolute supremacy of the British Government throughout the country, and making every so-called independent State responsible to it. This notion of a balance of power has now been discarded by probably even the wildest and most ignorant politicians who

interest themselves about the subject; but old fallacies are for ever cropping up, and we may discern our former acquaintance, under another name, in the proposal which has been more than once put forward by Mr. Bright, with all the vagueness, indeed, which distinguishes his utterances about India, but which, so far as it can be understood, appears to involve the division of India into a system of federated governments, the virtues of which are to be in direct proportion to the degree in which the present English governors of India should retire from a share in the administration, and leave that country to be governed by the Indians themselves. The fallacy of the assumption which underlies this proposal is obviously that, because the people of India have now become more peaceable and humane, and the country more generally prosperous and well-ordered, the improvement is due to the spirit of civilisation and self-government inherent in the people of India and their princes, and gradually becoming more strongly developed; the assumption ignoring the fact that this improvement is due solely to the strong control exercised by the British administration, and that all the elements still exist for a state of anarchy, which would at once revive if that control were withdrawn.

Lord Minto had now been Governor-General for nearly six years, and the period for which he had agreed to expatriate himself was drawing to a close. His administration, although not distinguished by the extraordinary events and brilliant conquests which signalled that of Lord Wellesley, had yet been marked by the complete overthrow of French rivalry in the East. Under his wise and prudent management the finances of the country had been restored to a satisfactory and stable condition, while the public services in all branches had been brought to display a marked and specific advance towards a higher standard of efficiency and discipline. And the Governor-General had been uniformly successful in everything undertaken by him, while gaining general popularity and respect from all persons in India, and without incurring the hostility, or even the opposition, of any of the authorities at home. His extreme moderation as a party man, too, rendered it possible for him to be on good terms with whichever party was in power. It might therefore have been expected that in his case, if ever it could happen, his term of office would be allowed to run its full course; so much at least would be merited by his great and honourable services. Yet Lord Minto was recalled. He had asked to be relieved at the end of 1813, and indeed had fixed on the first day of the following year

for his departure from India; but in the summer of 1813 he learned that, six months before, it had been decided to supersede him, not from any want of confidence or cause of dissatisfaction, but because the Ministry could not resist the demand made on them by the Prince Regent to provide for his friend, Lord Moira, who was in want of money. The Court of Directors reluctantly submitted to the pressure put upon them by the Government, and accompanied their resolution of recall with another, warmly acknowledging Lord Minto's eminent services. Well may the editor say that 'nothing could be more undeserved, more ungracious, or more creditable to the parties concerned.' Well might Lord Minto say, on receiving the news, that 'the supersession is defended by its authors by arguments entirely foreign to the usual merits of such questions; that is to say, upon the several grounds of excessive favour to another man, of political arrangements of office, and of commands which must be obeyed without hesitation or remonstrance;' and that they were employing reasons which were in part new to English public life, and the remainder entirely new in application to the appointment of a Governor-General. It was one of the shabbiest things ever done by a modern Cabinet. However, the notice of recall was accompanied by intimation of his elevation to an earldom. Lord Minto accepted the treatment with his usual even temper, although the premature arrival of the new Governor-General involved his remaining some time at Calcutta after he had given over charge of his office, there being no vessel immediately available for his passage. As an old friend wrote to him: 'Your Indian administration has been thrown away upon a Government incapable of appreciating it, and perhaps with a selfish motive of keeping it back from the public. Either Mauritius or Batavia should have made the fortune of a Governor-General.' The news of the recall created much more indignation among the European residents of Calcutta than it caused to the Governor-General himself.

Lord Minto left India early in 1814, again sailing in a frigate commanded by his son George, and accompanied also by his younger son John and the wives and infants of both brothers. He reached England in May, having at last realised, as he believed, the time for which during his long exile he had been so ardently longing. Almost all the other members of the family met him in London, except his wife. She awaited him at Minto. It was agreed between them that the delay in meeting would be fully compensated by the superior happiness of meeting at home.

London was at this time in a whirl of excitement and delight. When Lord Minto had sailed for India, we stood alone in Europe, and Napoleon's fortunes were at their highest; although Trafalgar had cleared the sea of his fleets, no enterprise by land seemed impossible to his arms. But now there was in English hearts 'the proud consciousness, to which a great Whig statesman (Lord Russell) has given expression, that "the constancy, courage, and perseverance of the English people, animating the prostrate nations of the Continent, had at length achieved a triumph over the most formidable combination of military genius, warlike population, conquering armies, and political talent, which ever threatened the independence of our country." ' London overflowed with Emperors, Kings, and Field-Mmarshals,' and it added to the delight of the ex-Governor-General who had contributed his share towards the final success, and of his friends who greeted him, that his arrival should take place amidst this scene of splendour and triumph. 'But to him, and to those who waited for him, all other feelings were swallowed up in the joy of reunion—actual or at hand.' Lord Minto was detained for a few days in London, to call upon Ministers, and attend at Court, and to receive the congratulations of the Court of Directors at one of their dinners. Meanwhile—

'every day brought him letters from his wife, showing that she lived in the thought of their approaching union, while, with the unselfishness and strong sense of duty which distinguished her, she assured him she would not be miserable, and that he must not hurry away from London till all claims on his attention had been satisfied. Nothing interested her but the preparations for the moment to which all were looking forward; nothing calmed her but an active participation in them.'

Her husband replies :—

'I have your letters of Thursday and Saturday, and I am thankful, my dearest love, that your cares are heaved overboard. We have now nothing to do but to be thankful and happy. The period to come will, I trust, be unshadowed by absences, or that they will be very short, and that we shall enjoy the tranquil comforts of content and of mutual love for the rest of our time, while the younger generations flourish away in the more lively joys of their period of life.'

This was on May 20. June 3, the day after the Drawing-room, was fixed for Lord Minto's departure for the North; but on May 28 his brother-in-law, Lord Auckland, died suddenly, and in order to be with his sister in her grief, and to follow his brother-in-law to the grave, Lord Minto postponed his departure. The funeral took place at Beckenham—the parish in

which Eden Farm was situated—and at night. The procession by road from London and the subsequent funeral service occupied five hours in a ‘cold drizzling rain :’—

‘A cold which Lord Minto was suffering from before was greatly increased by the exposure of that fatal night. He was ordered to stay indoors. On the 8th “he broke prison to visit Lord Melville and “obtain a nephew’s well-earned promotion.” On the 13th he confessed himself so low in strength and spirits that he could not attempt a letter. In proportion to his bodily weakness was the increase of his passionate longing to reach Minto; and his family, having no apprehension of the impending danger, were equally anxious with himself to get him out of town and in the safe keeping of his home. “With “the affectionate kindness which never flagged he resolved to visit “Lady Malmesbury at Park Place, although this added at least another “day to the length of his journey.” While there he endeavoured to conceal his weakness, but his eldest son . . . had now become alarmed; a medical man was sent for . . . and from him it was ascertained that Lord Minto was suffering from an attack of a most alarming disease. . . . His longing to push on was, however, too strong to be opposed. The journey was proceeded with. “He has but one wish,” wrote the son to the mother in Scotland, “to see the person on whom his “thoughts are ever fixed.” The rest may be guessed. From the first horrid misgiving, when the ground seems to fall away from under one’s feet, to the full conviction that there is no help, no hope, no escape from an overwhelming calamity, most of us know the course.’

The sick man died at Stevenage, on the northern road, on June 21.

‘When, in process of time, it became the part of another generation to “open the places that were closed,” and when, upon those who did so, came the desire “to show the image of a voice and make green the “flowers that were withered,” the last year’s letters from Minto to India—so full of hope, of joy—were found tied together with a black string, and inscribed “Poor fools.” With these was a note with unbroken seal, the last written by Lady Minto to her husband.’

The pathos of this needs no comment. We shall be greatly mistaken if the readers who have followed us so far do not turn quickly to the original volume from which these extracts have been made. It completes the record of a worthy life, worthily told. If we have a fault to find with this most interesting book, it is that the editor has exhibited the very unusual quality of being too sparing of her materials. We grudge the brevity of the book, feeling that the memoir would have been even better if it had been somewhat longer. Of how few books can this be said!

- ART IX.—1. *Political Studies*. By the Honourable GEORGE C. BRODRICK. 8vo. London: 1879.
2. *England*. By Mr. T. S. ESCOTT. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1879.
3. *Essays on Finance*. By ROBERT GIFFEN. 8vo. London: 1879.

IN one of the last letters we had the honour to receive from the late Earl Russell, written soon after the general election of 1874, that eminent and consistent statesman expressed his conviction that ‘whenever the Liberal party is reconstituted, it will be on a Whig basis.’ To ourselves these were weighty words, for they confirmed and encouraged us in the course from which this Journal has never deviated, and in the principles it has steadily endeavoured to maintain. But we are well aware that to some members of the Liberal party—to such writers as Mr. Goldwin Smith, and to some of our friends who sit below the gangway—the prediction of Lord Russell will appear to be a mere aristocratic pretension or an antiquated delusion. It would seem, from the language they sometimes hold, as if the time was come for the development and evolution of the Whigs into some higher form of being, and as if they thought there was something humiliating in the connexion with their ancient allies and leaders. We believe such dreams, if they exist at all in any rational mind, to be utterly unfounded. The attempt to shake the union and depose the chiefs of the Liberal party may be a natural and even allowable piece of tactics on the part of our opponents, and we shall presently see that they have not neglected to use it. But on the part of those who desire to restore and support a Liberal Government, it is mere self-destruction. We profess to support Whig principles, not only because they are those of a great historic party—not only because they are held by men of the highest character, ability, and position—not only because we believe them to be the solid foundation of good government—but also because they are in the main the principles and opinions of the great mass of intelligence and liberality in the country. On the one side there may be, and are, large popular masses easily excited by eloquent and passionate appeals, and among them the crotchet-mongers of the day find more or less acceptance. On the other side, there is a dense mass of prejudice and ignorance which may be worked upon with effect by Tory oratory. Between the two extremes lies what the French in their political language call the Left

Centre—the men of liberal but not extreme opinions, fervent in their attachment to freedom, but not less opposed to rash and violent innovation.

It matters little by what name this large and important middle party may be described; call them Whigs, Moderate Liberals, or even Liberal Conservatives, if you will. We assert, and we rely upon the fact, that the most important and influential portion of English political society at the present time consists of men who are perhaps less demonstrative than their neighbours; who esteem sobriety of language, dignity of demeanour, and steadfastness in action, as the first qualities of statesmanship; who distrust alike exuberant powers of eloquence and mysterious artifices of policy; who condemn and detest unjust, unnecessary, and costly wars; who are not imposed upon by the tinsel and bombast of the present Administration; but who cling to the good old cause of constitutional progress with stability of principles and fixity of purpose. And we affirm that it is in this class of men, who are Liberals without being Radicals or democrats, that the true centre of gravity of the Liberal party lies. It rests mainly with them to determine to which side the balance of parties and of power will incline. If the general election of 1874 was unfavourable in its results to the Minister of the day, it must have been because a considerable number of those electors who had borne him triumphantly into power in 1868 saw reason to withdraw their support from him. The advanced portion of the Liberal party doubtless adhered to him with undiminished enthusiasm. But the more moderate, or if you will the more timid, class of his supporters had been alarmed by the unprecedented energy of the measures which had been carried, and of those which were supposed to be in contemplation, and we saw the result. At the present time there are ample causes in the adventurous career of the present Ministry to justify similar apprehensions amongst their adherents. The country, and the wisest men in it, are repelled by these frequent wars, these entangling engagements abroad, this reckless administration of the finances, and by the arbitrary tone of a statesman who acts as if he wielded, in the name of the Crown, an irresponsible power. It is highly probable that whenever the next general election takes place, a majority of the constituencies of the United Kingdom will condemn the policy of this Government and reject its candidates. But this result can only be obtained if the class of men whom we have described give an energetic support to the Opposition, and distinctly see their way to the formation of a more prudent, more secure, and more able ad-

ministration. What Mr. Lecky has ingeniously termed the 'highly accentuated policy' of Mr. Gladstone was as unwelcome to the country in 1874 as the Imperial visions of Lord Beaconsfield have since become. Quiet people cannot live on such highly seasoned dishes; and although this stimulating diet may be appropriate to the stress and turmoil of an electoral conflict, it is not by such means that the government of the country in ordinary times can be carried on. We look beyond the struggle of the moment to the Government of the future. In the *mêlée* of a general election, the combatants on both sides resort to a thousand devices to catch votes. But a firm and stable Government can only be maintained on fixed principles, which it is alike impolitic and dishonest to compromise or to surrender.

The Liberal party is avowedly a composite body. Liberal opinions are, as the late Mrs. Stanley remarked in her interesting reflections, the Protestantism of politics, dividing itself into numerous sects, whilst Toryism aspires to exercise over its adherents an authority in unity resembling that of the Church of Rome. Believe in that authority, and you may renounce the exercise of reason. We are in no way concerned to deny that many Liberals hold extreme and eccentric views. Men of patriotic and benevolent minds may think it desirable to ask the sanction of Parliament to the Permissive Liquor Bill, the female franchise, or even the propagation of small-pox and other diseases. But all this has nothing to do with the cardinal principles on which the whole Liberal party is well agreed. What those principles are we shall presently endeavour to show. It is obvious that the agreement extends to the essential traditions of our history as a party, whether in or out of office, and not to the peculiar views of any individual. These essential traditions have been defended and applied by the Whigs for nearly two centuries; and it is on them, therefore, that Lord Russell conceived that the Liberal party would one day be reconstituted. By the term 'Whig basis' he meant to designate, not a clique or coterie of aristocratic statesmen, but the pith and marrow of the nation.

Our contention is, that although the arts of democratic agitation may be used to stir the masses and to kindle a short-lived enthusiasm, they are in truth injurious to the permanent interests of the Liberal party, because they shake the faith of the more temperate and sagacious classes in the sobriety and wisdom of their rulers. The very charge of rashness and an adventurous spirit which is urged against the Government, may be retorted on its assailants. To court adventures at

home is at least as perilous as to seek them abroad. The true interest and the true desire of the nation is to avoid them altogether.

This prosaic view of the duties of government is not, we are happy to find, confined to authorities as venerable as that of the late Earl Russell and of this Journal, which is accused, with truth, of having outlived the threescore years and ten allotted to human existence. If we turn to the writings of Mr. George Brodrick, which we have placed at the head of this article, and which will well repay a careful perusal, we find a Liberal of the present time, and of the present type, a firm believer in the progress of democratic opinions and influence, contending for precisely the same views which we submit to the consideration of our friends. Mr. Brodrick tells us that amongst the proposals for the regeneration of the Liberal party, none have ever been more ably advocated or more heartily embraced by the Radical section of the party, than the proposal to emancipate it henceforth from Whig influence. It is alleged, he adds, that nothing but a series of accidents attached the Whig aristocracy to the cause of the people in former ages, that its sympathies have invariably gravitated towards Conservatism since the cause of the people has become identified with the progress of democracy, and that its alliance with Radicalism having become an anachronism and a delusion ought now to be dissolved in the interest of the Liberal party, which cannot otherwise put forth the real strength latent in its democratic ideal. So that while the Tories accuse us of having sold our principles to Radicalism and democracy, the Radical charge is that we are born aristocrats, and never cared for the cause of the people. To the former attack we reply by a declaration of our present unchanged views; to the latter by an appeal to the past services of the Whig party. Mr. Brodrick emphatically refutes these arguments in language we willingly adopt as our own:—

‘I believe what is called the Whig, but I should call the moderate section of the Liberal party, to be the soundest, the stablest, and the solidest element in that party—an element which it would be impossible to replace and therefore suicidal to expel.’ *

‘It is not Whiggism, but statesmanship and common sense, to keep the head cool in moments of national excitement, to mistrust the capacity of indignation meetings to regulate foreign policy, and to foresee the probability that a passionate and one-sided agitation in favour of a philanthropic crusade would provoke a counter-agitation, equally passionate and one-sided, in favour of war for “British

* Political Sketches, p. 243.

"interests." Had the words of truth and soberness obtained a fair hearing—had not the counsels of moderation and political experience been rejected with the contempt of ignorance—the Liberal party might not have frittered away in philo-Bulgarian and anti-Turkish demonstrations, not unmixed with unpatriotic self-abasement, that moral power which should have been reserved to force, if need be, upon the Government a consistent and dignified non-intervention.*

'But this is not the only justification for Whig ascendancy in the Liberal party. To speak frankly, there is a widespread and by no means unfounded belief in this country that an hereditary connexion with a party is among the most powerful of all securities for political fidelity. A man who has risen to political eminence by his brains and energy alone has nothing to lose but his reputation for consistency—which may be a worthless stake—by changing his opinions, if not his allegiance, as often as he may find it convenient. It is far otherwise with a man such as Lord Hartington, who inherits a name and family traditions associated with some of the noblest memories of our constitutional history. To him the desertion of his party and principles might be the loss of *caste*, the loss of a great position in society, the loss of all that can make public life, and of much that makes private life, desirable to an Englishman. It is idle to ignore the fact that a party leader, so born and so circumstanced, is bound over in far heavier recognisances than ordinary men to political loyalty; and it is therefore unfair to deny the existence of legitimate motives for the elevation of Lord Hartington to the post vacated by Mr. Gladstone.' †

'Even in France, where democracy is far better organised than in England, and where the idea of social equality has long been familiar, the Extreme Left has proved itself greatly inferior to the Left Centre in the higher political virtues, and the one beneficent revolution that has been effected in French politics since the end of the war has been effected upon principles which may properly be called Whig principles. In the English House of Commons, however, the Left Centre includes not only Whigs, but men like Mr. Goschen, Mr. Childers, Mr. Forster, and Mr. Stansfield, who have nothing in common with the Whigs except the general moderation of their views and a sense of political responsibility. To exclude such men from the councils of the Liberal party, and to drive them—were that possible—into becoming the left wing of the Right Centre, would be an act of downright political suicide, worthy only of Spanish revolutionists.' ‡

'It may be that we have arrived at that which economists call the "stationary condition" in politics, and that no grand political reforms, but only administrative improvements, remain to be accomplished by the Liberal party in the present generation. In that case, it would be the destructive energy of "thorough-going Liberals," and not the more cautious and thoughtful statesmanship of the Whig school, that would find itself out of harmony with the spirit of the age. In neither case, and in no case that can be imagined, could the democratic section of

* Political Sketches, p. 246.

† Ibid. p. 249.

‡ Ibid. p. 254.

the Liberal party (if such a section existed) afford to dispense with the aid of the so-called Whigs, that is, of men fitted by education, character, and conviction, to harmonise democratic ideas with the permanent Conservative forces of the country. It is among them, and not among the Radicals, that constructive ability is still to be found; it is they, and not the Radicals, who thoroughly understand the difference between a faction and a party. The sinister maxim *Divide et impera* would, indeed, be fatally misapplied, if it were applied, by advocates of democracy, to produce a dissolution of that union which constitutes the Liberal party, which enables it, even in its lowest depression, to maintain a national character, and which is the best security for its continual influence on the political destinies of England.*

We have quoted these passages because they appear to us to state the truth in frank and manly language, and they deserve to be widely read. But we have no desire to insist on any causes of division in the ranks of the Liberal party—still less to claim for the Whigs a share of power in excess of their influence and station in the country. Mr. Escott remarks in his work on England, which gives a fair and impartial, though rather superficial, view of our institutions, that, although the basis of our constitution is extremely democratic, the business of administration has been in the main conducted by members of the aristocracy. This combination of the two great elements of political society, in which neither of them absolutely predominates, is the true secret of our national strength and freedom. For when we speak of aristocracy in England, it must always be remembered that it is an open aristocracy, perpetually recruited from the middle classes. Even in a Tory Ministry, Lord Cranbrook, Lord Cairns, and Lord Beaconsfield spring from the mercantile, professional, or literary classes, and have won their rank by their own exertions; Mr. Cross and Mr. W. H. Smith, who are not born aristocrats, rank in the Cabinet with the heirs of the Percys and the Cecils. Hereditary rank in our statesmen is rather an accident and an exception than the rule. A large proportion of the political leaders of the day owe their position in the House of Lords and in the country to their own talents. That is one reason why rank in England has never ceased to command respect and regard. M. Guizot said, when he came to England in 1848, that he found ‘une aristocratie sans morgue et un peuple sans envie.’ The middle and the lower classes of society look with complacency on the dignity with which past or present services have clothed their rulers; and English society being what it is, a Ministry would be sin-

* Political Sketches, p. 256.

gularly weakened by the total exclusion of the aristocratic element. Does anyone suppose that if a Cabinet could be formed out of the same elements as a town-council, it would have a long existence? Mr. Gladstone has justly remarked in one of his recent Essays, that the passion of equality and the hatred of superiority of rank are not characteristics of the English people. On the contrary, the middle classes are infected by an exaggerated respect for it. But the reason is, that every man knows that these distinctions, and whatever privileges attach to them, are accessible to all who have industry, talent, and good fortune to acquire them.

Our Conservative contemporary, the 'Quarterly Review,' has recently presented to the world a view of Whig principles which we cannot accept, for the little truth contained in it is mingled with a vast deal of misconception.

'What brought the Whigs to the front in 1830,' he says, 'was their position as aristocratic party leaders, not their love of popular liberty. In the second place the Whigs presided over the settlement just as they did in 1715, because the Tories refused to have anything to do with it; and as soon as the Tories acquiesced in the settlement, the weakness of the Whigs, as depending on the Irish and Radical factions, became apparent. In the third place, the reforms which were required to resettle the Constitution have, most of them, been carried out, and the Whigs have always protested that they were as firmly attached as the Tories to the Constitution itself. Lastly, the Whigs no longer govern as a proud aristocracy at the head of a compact body of parliamentary clients, but merely act as the delegated instruments of democracy. They raise the moderate-sounding cry of "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform," in order to reassure the more timid members of the party; but though the words may have a Liberal sound, we may be certain that they will have a Radical meaning.'*

We suppose it may be considered fair in political warfare, especially on the eve of a general election, to impute to the opposite party whatever may serve most effectively to discredit it; and we therefore do not complain of the strange misrepresentations in this passage. On the contrary, we are rather glad to have an opportunity of stating more explicitly at the present time what we consider the duties and principles of the Whig party to be. There is something far more important than what may be termed electoral politics, deflected and blown from side to side by the gusts and storms of a great political contest. We, who are neither candidates for office nor for a seat in Parliament, are comparatively unaffected by them. A political writer in his humbler sphere should look

* Quarterly Review, No. 296, p. 589.

solely to the permanent principles which he has adopted, and has no excuse at all for wavering in the defence of truth. We know not what may be the result of the next election to this or that candidate, or even to this or that party. But we are deeply interested in knowing on what principles the future government of the country is to be carried on.

It is scarcely worth while to dwell on what our contemporary says of the Reform Bill of 1830. The fact is, that the obstructive blindness of the Tories had brought the country to the verge of a revolution. The king could not show his face in the City. The agricultural districts were on fire. The great towns were agitated. Ireland was under the sway of O'Connell. When the Whigs succeeded to power, their first duty was to restore order and confidence in the Government. They did so by boldly satisfying the just demands of the people; but they did not succumb to O'Connell, who denounced them in the most ferocious language, nor did they yield to the pressure of their Radical allies. On the contrary, the Radical party gradually melted away, under the steady policy of the Whig leaders, until Charles Buller said that he and Molesworth would be left alone to 'count' Mr. Grote. What is meant by the settlement of 1715 we do not know, unless it be that the Whigs of that day upheld the Act of Settlement passed in 1700, and defeated a Jacobite conspiracy of the last Tory Ministers of Queen Anne, by securing the accession of the House of Hanover. It is true that the Whigs have always claimed the title of 'friends of the Constitution' as their proudest denomination; and that they have on many great occasions defended constitutional principles against the assumed authority or the corrupting influence of those who claimed to act on behalf of the Crown. The whole political history of the last century is a contest between prerogative and Parliamentary power. It is needless to say on which side the Whigs fought. No sooner are the Tories reinstated in power, and backed by a strong majority, than similar questions are raised. The influence of prerogative is again distinctly asserted and felt in public affairs. It is still more openly defended in books published under the patronage of the Court. To this we reply that these are not the doctrines which placed the House of Hanover on the throne, and which have kept it there. The true Whig principle is to oppose them, and to uphold the Constitution against all attacks, whether from above or from below. Sir Robert Peel in 1837 spoke sound Whig doctrine when he said, 'I see the necessity of widening the foundations on which our Constitution and our religious esta-

'blishments must rest.' Our contemporary supposes that we are animated by some mystical faith in the perfectibility of mankind, whilst the Conservatives 'restrict their views of 'earthly existence by the limits of the Christian revelation.' We can assure him we are content to live within the same limits, and are not in the least concerned to know what lies beyond them. If there be one merit more than another which may be fairly claimed by Whig statesmen, it is that their policy is of a practical and not of an imaginative character, and that they disdain to deceive the people by wild theories of human perfectibility or by gorgeous dreams of Imperial power.

On this ground, we emphatically deny that the Whigs are the 'delegated instruments of democracy,' or that 'the moderate 'terms of the programme of the Liberal party will certainly 'have a Radical meaning.' Men are apt to speak of democracy as if it were synonymous with free institutions and popular government. But democracy is not all of one colour; it has as many hues as the chameleon. There is the democracy of the Commune of France and the Nihilists of Russia, which is revolutionary and destructive; there is the democracy which exults in military glory and Imperialism, and adores a Napoleon or a Bismarck; there is the democracy of Toryism, by which Mr. Disraeli sought in 1867 to crush the Liberalism of the middle classes, and to which Lord Beaconsfield still looks for support. All these powers are the delegated instruments of democracy as much as, or more than, the Whig party, whose chief crime it is that it looks beyond the democratic passions and idols of the hour to the permanent liberties and interests of the nation.

As much may be said of the false construction which has been put upon the intentions of the Whigs. The programme of the Liberal party has the meaning which the words convey, neither more nor less. It consists of three points:—

I. The equalisation of the borough and the county franchise—a measure which the simplest principles of logic and justice demand, and which the Conservatives themselves, if they were to remain in office, would probably carry within a few years. Such a measure must be accompanied with some fresh adjustment of seats to meet the claims of a fluctuating population; but we are not prepared to reduce the number of the representatives of Ireland, or to add, with Mr. Gladstone, eighteen members to the representation of Scotland.

II. The establishment of Local Boards for the administration of county business, on the elective principle, in order to remove an acknowledged anomaly in our provincial system, and

to introduce unity of local authority in place of the numerous and conflicting jurisdictions now in existence.

III. A modification of the law of entail, with greater facilities for the liberation of encumbered estates, and for the transfer of land, under the control of a Court or Board of competent jurisdiction—a measure equally beneficial to the owners of land, to their families, and to the agricultural interest.

To these proposals it may be added, that it is the earnest desire of the Liberal party to accomplish the long-deferred and long-desired reform of the Corporation of London, and to confer upon the whole of the metropolis, which exceeds many a continental state in wealth and population, the rights and benefits of our comprehensive and popular system of municipal government as it exists in every other large city in the kingdom.

These points comprise the whole programme of the Liberal party at the present time. To these measures Lord Hartington and Mr. Forster have pledged themselves in the event of their accession to power; and what is perhaps of even more importance, these are the terms of agreement which have been accepted by the more advanced sections of the Liberal party as the ground of their support. They certainly are not of a nature to alarm anyone professing Liberal opinions, and they might even be carried in a Conservative House of Commons. Thus far the leaders of the party have pledged their responsibility, but not a step beyond, at the present time and in the present state of affairs. The wild and visionary schemes based on the 'perfectibility of man' are mere devices of an imaginative opponent. We see no reason to borrow our foreign policy from Mr. Baxter or Mr. Rylands, or to accept from Mr. Chamberlain his system of municipal finance and the electoral caucus—a democratic artifice to make the will of the few appear the choice of the many—or the prohibition of liquor from Sir Wilfrid Lawson, or Home Rule from Mr. Parnell. Whenever these gentlemen are summoned to power by the confidence of the Crown and the will of Parliament, they will, of course, carry into effect the measures which they regard as salutary and essential to the public welfare. In the meantime we respect the freedom with which they seek to bring round public opinion to their views; but at present we do not share them. Nothing can be more disingenuous to an adversary than to impute to the whole Liberal party and its recognised chiefs the opinions or schemes of Mr. Chamberlain, which are chiefly remarkable for their total impracticability and for the slender support they have received in the House of Commons. We might just as well accuse the present

Government of an intention to reimpose a five-shilling duty on corn, because the Duke of Rutland advocates that measure; and his Grace no doubt finds a certain amount of sympathy at the Grantham farmers' ordinary. The truth is, that on both sides these extreme views are of small account, and will have no effect, except in so far as they tend to disintegrate the party to which they are attached, by throwing on it distrust and contempt.

But we do not deny that in addition to the questions which we conceive to be ripe for solution, and which may properly engage the attention of Parliament and lead to practical legislation, there are a multitude of other political subjects, floating, as it were, in the air, and which, at some future time, may assume a positive importance. Since we are challenged to confess the faith that is in us and to repudiate the opinions falsely attributed to the Whig party, we feel not the slightest difficulty or hesitation in stating what we conceive the principles of the Whigs to be on any of these questions, and we will take them in their order.

And, first of all, though this declaration may seem uncalled for in a civilised country, we are firmly resolved to uphold and execute the laws for the defence of life and property, which are the foundation of society. It is not altogether superfluous to say so when the right to break contracts and refuse payment of rents is loudly proclaimed in one part of the United Kingdom, and enforced by threats to murder not only the landlords who claim their rents, but the law-abiding tenants who wish to pay them. A good deal has been said by some of the philosophical writers of the day against the existing tenure of property, more especially of real property, and in various forms the theory of the Communists, that property is only held by the permission and by the will of the State, which may resume it at pleasure for the public benefit, has filtered into politics. Even one of Mr. Gladstone's speeches in Scotland appeared to countenance that idea; and amongst the causes of the fall of his Administration in 1874 one of the most powerful was the reckless and arbitrary manner in which the Charity Commissioners had assumed a power of dealing with trusts and endowments. Some members of the Radical party have declared their hostility to all settled corporate property; and Sir Arthur Hobhouse, in his recently published volume called the 'Dead Hand,' declares war against all settlements, and would confer unlimited power to dispose of property on the actual and casual possessors of it. Estates would then cease to be limited, or under the protection of law. Every man might make away

with his own. M. de Tocqueville remarked, in his latest work on 'France before the Revolution,' that nothing contributed more to shake the faith of the nation in the right of private property and to prepare that great social cataclysm, than the attacks of the Government on public and private endowments. The Revolution began with these aggressive measures on the part of the State, and ended in a scramble on the part of the people. It is difficult to draw the line short of the absolute rules of ownership recognised by the law. One man is not poorer because another is rich; one man does not forfeit his rights because another man might make a better use of them. And the most sacred rights of property are those which extend beyond the present to the future generation.

Does any man suppose that, if property in land could be so lightly dealt with, the public debt of the State and the vast fabric of credit based upon it could be maintained inviolate? Nothing can be more invidious and absurd than to draw a distinction between property in land, property secured by mortgage on the land, property borrowed by the State, and property invested in a thousand different forms. Touch one, touch all. We hold that the slightest approach to a relaxation of strict legal rights is equally dangerous and pernicious in an economical and in a political sense. Society itself is based upon the rights of property, and in this country especially, as long as law and order are preserved in it, any attack on property will be fatal to the political party which may be rash enough to make it.

We are told by our contemporary that within the next twenty years this nation will have irrevocably pronounced what direction its 'progress' is to take—whether by constitutional development or by revolutionary change—whether the Empire is to be consolidated or dismembered—whether Church and State are to be severed or united—whether the form of our Government is to be a monarchy or a republic. This is the language which we have heard in every crisis, not for twenty years only, but for the last fifty years. It is precisely the view of the Duke of Wellington, who said that if the Reform Bill of 1832 passed, neither Church nor property, nor colonies, nor union with Ireland, nor eventually monarchy could be saved. We know not what effect Tory government for the next twenty years might have on the fundamental institutions of the country: probably they might be in some danger from the violence of the reaction which would follow, as it did in 1830, a long period of Tory rule. But for our forbears and ourselves we assert with confidence

that if none of these calamities have happened, and if the monarchy and the Constitution are ten times as strong as they were under the Regency and in the reign of George IV., it is because the fundamental institutions of the country have been purged, repaired, and reformed by Whig statesmen, in despite of the strenuous efforts of a Tory Opposition. The Whigs therefore claim not only to be the friends of the Constitution, but the authors and saviours of it. It is all very well for the Conservatives of the present day to talk of 'constitutional development;' but that is the very essence of Whig doctrine. Genuine Toryism systematically opposed all change in the Parliamentary franchise, in the law, in the Church, in municipal government, and a hundred other things. If these institutions have acquired fresh strength, as we believe that they have, they owe it to their timely renovation. The true points and principles of conflict between the two great parties have been for centuries the contest between the old and the new, between stagnation and progress, between resistance and timely concession, between freedom and monopoly, between the interests of classes and the interests of the people. But now-a-days things are so changed that even our excellent contemporary is carried away by the stream and talks Whiggism without knowing it.

‘Quantum mutatus ab illo
Hectore’

who fought with desperation in 1831 the battle of the last rotten borough in Schedule A. Nay, so large and rapid has been the change that we have lived to see the most democratic measure of reform ever yet proposed, emanate from a Conservative Cabinet and be passed by a highly educated Tory majority. When Conservatism has given birth to the household franchise and the lodger clause, we may well look back with modest assurance to the far humbler efforts of our own predecessors; and if any hand has been raised against what a more poetic generation called the ‘Ark of the Constitution,’ that hand is not our own.

By an equally strange perversion of facts and principles, it is made to appear that the Whigs are not the friends and supporters of the National Church. We should say that nothing is more constant in English history than the determination of the Whigs to oppose High Church principles and sacerdotal pretensions, by subjecting them to the salutary control of civil authority and law. An established Church means a Church regulated by the law of the land: that is what we desire to preserve. The supremacy of the Crown in the Church and

the submission of the clergy are the bases of the English Reformation, of the Acts of Elizabeth, and of our whole ecclesiastical system, founded on the authority of Parliament. In the seventeenth century, in the eighteenth century, and in our own times, all the world knows by whom these principles have been assailed and by whom they have been defended. To dis-establish a Church and to sever its connexion with the State is simply to free it from the control of law and to abandon it to the pretensions of its spiritual chiefs. That is what at this moment the High Church party and nonjuring clergy desire, and what the great majority of the laity of England dread and detest. To maintain the authority of the Crown and of Parliament in the Church and paramount to the clergy, has ever been a Whig principle of the first importance; and it is in consideration of this submission that the clergy hold their temporalities and exercise a lawful authority. But whilst we maintain in its integrity the principle of a National Church, founded on the law and protected by it, we desire that the forms and offices of the Church should be so regulated as to embrace the largest possible number of our fellow-countrymen. The Church is and ought to be the refuge and the consolation of thousands who have no other friend; and it must be said, to the honour of the English clergy, that for the most part they discharge their parochial duties with fervour, liberality, and charity. The more liberal she is, the more she will disarm the prejudices and blunt the hostility of those who have withdrawn from her communion. By passing and accepting the Burials Act, which must be one of the first acts of a Liberal Government, the last legitimate ground of complaint will be removed; and those who desire to uphold and defend the cause of Protestantism and free religious enquiry in this nation ought to be united by considerations far more powerful than the causes which unhappily divide them.*

The Church of England, therefore, is in no danger from the Whigs, and we will add in no danger from the Dissenters. Her chief danger arises from the men within her own walls who refuse to acknowledge the law of Church government by

* We have heard with pleasure that at the late Church Congress at Swansea some of the clergy were received and hospitably entertained by leading Dissenters in the town, and the meetings of the Congress were attended with interest by several Dissenting ministers. Such an evidence of the progress of mutual tolerance and common interest in the welfare of religion is one of the best signs of the stability of the Church of England.

which they are bound ; who are endeavouring to corrupt the Anglican Church by Romish doctrine and practices ; and who are not ashamed to prevaricate in their obedience to the most solemn obligations. Whig principles in the Church mean the extension of lay influence and authority in ecclesiastical affairs and in Convocation, the abolition of unnecessary tests, the removal of a few obsolete passages in the Liturgy which are a stumbling-block in her path, the application of a liberal policy to the diversities of personal opinion, and the maintenance of the Church of England by all the means which may enlarge her boundaries and preserve her as a truly national institution. These are not the views of the partisans of Disestablishment, or of the enemies of the Church. We claim, on the contrary, to be her best friends, since we adhere most closely to the spirit of the Reformation and the tenor of her laws. If we turn to measures of practical legislation, none have been more beneficial to the Church than the Tithes Act, the abolition of pluralities, and the schemes of the Ecclesiastical Commission, which are all framed on sound Whig principles.

So little do we accept the charge that the Whigs have degenerated into the ‘delegated instruments of democracy,’ that we readily admit that the Whig party has not unfrequently held and defended the unpopular side in important controversies. The question with us is not what is popular, but what is sound, just, and right ; and we hold it to be one of the duties of statesmen to combat popular delusions, even at the cost of place and power. This is especially true of foreign politics, on which popular enthusiasm is easily excited by appeals to national pride, to the pugnacity of the masses, and to the ignorance of the greater number. Lord Salisbury never was better inspired than when he recommended his audience to study large maps, though he has since lost sight of them himself. Lord Beaconsfield has received ovations for achievements which might have merited a different reception. The Government owes whatever success its foreign policy has obtained in this country to the very passions of democracy, which it would be well to restrain. A wise and pacific policy is much less apt to catch the popular favour than a rash and adventurous one ; in fact we have frequently observed that a Foreign Minister is most applauded for his least defensible actions, and gains no credit for his wisest measures.

The late Lord Clarendon was, in our opinion, a safer and abler Minister of Foreign Affairs than Lord Palmerston, because he obtained the confidence and regard of all foreign Powers, without exciting either their fear or their hatred ; and

he never condescended to appeal to the popular voice on intricate questions of foreign policy; but for this reason he was less applauded and less understood. Both these Foreign Ministers were, however, eminent Whig statesmen, perfectly acquainted with the duties of their office, and it is preposterous to contend that under them England did not hold her just rank and influence in the councils of Europe. Both of them stood far above the Tory administration of foreign affairs by Lord Aberdeen, or even the Duke of Wellington. They emancipated this country from the influence of the Continental Courts; they gave the moral support of this country to constitutional government abroad; they maintained peace in many difficult crises; but when war was forced upon them by the aggressive policy of Russia, they fought and defeated her in close alliance with France, and dictated the conditions of peace. These were the Whig principles and acts of that day. It is true that the theory of an Imperial policy had not then been invented.

How stands the question with reference to the commercial policy of the country? The great free-trade measures of Sir Robert Peel, which had been advocated for years by the Whigs and combated by the Tories, were at last carried by a combination of the most able statesmen in the country. They were defended with the popular eloquence of Mr. Cobden; and they were justified in the eyes even of their opponents by a long period of extraordinary prosperity, due partly to free trade and partly to other causes. Nevertheless, we are by no means certain that the theory of free trade has been mastered by the majority. No sooner is the pressure of competition, bad harvests, and adverse markets felt, than we begin to hear rumours that there is no such thing as free trade without reciprocity—a faint movement for retaliatory duties and other forms of protection is set on foot, and we should not be the least surprised to see the old bogle of protection revived by the Tories at the next general election, in spite of Lord Beaconsfield's frank and peremptory disclaimer of so great a step backwards. For, in truth, we perceive that our accomplished contemporary himself has a very imperfect conception of the principles of free trade, and still casts back lingering glances to the old restrictions on the food and trade of the country. We are 'not,' he says, 'to abandon, without an effort, the system we adopted in 1846; though we believe that system to be shortsighted and impolitic. . . . The adoption of free trade was a national act, and all classes in this country ought to feel that to surrender it would be a blow to the credit of Eng-

'land.' Ominous words! and there are more of them, which imply that the writer is a reluctant convert to the principles of free trade, which he imperfectly understands, and would renounce them, if he could, on behalf of the party whom he serves. What he calls 'Mr. Cobden's principles' were certainly not invented by Mr. Cobden, though Mr. Villiers and Mr. Cobden rendered them popular, and their first application to the British tariff is really due to Mr. Huskisson as long ago as in 1823. They are the principles which Adam Smith first placed upon a scientific basis, and which have the certainty and precision of a mathematical theorem, and they may be summed up in few words: 'In every country it always is and must be the interest of the great body of the people to buy whatever they want of those who sell it cheapest.*' . . . Consumption is the sole end and purpose of all production; and the interest of the producer ought to be attended to, only so far as it is necessary for promoting that of the consumer.'† To which we may add that, all trade being a process of exchange, it is impossible that the value of what we import from foreign countries should not be paid for by the export, direct or indirect, of articles of equivalent value produced or possessed by ourselves.

So rooted in the popular mind is the delusion of what used to be called the 'balance of trade,' that it is not uncommon for people to point to the excess of our imports over our exports as a proof that trade is declining, or is carried on at a loss. We would submit to them, in addition to what we have already said, two considerations, suggested by the excellent 'Essays on Finance,' recently published by Mr. Robert Giffen. In the first place, the whole foreign export trade of England amounts to about *one-eighth* of the total productive power of the country. Mr. Giffen estimates the whole income of the country at twelve hundred millions, and the net income derived from our exports at no more than one hundred and forty millions.‡ If this sum were lost altogether we should not be ruined; and a slight deduction from it ought to be almost unfelt. England does not live, as is commonly supposed, on her export trade. It is much nearer the truth to say that her import trade is indispensable to the existence of the people,

* Wealth of Nations, book iv. cap. 3.

† Ibid. book iv. cap. 8.

‡ See the problem worked out in the capital essays on 'Foreign Competition' and 'Excess of Imports,' pp. 142-160 of Mr. Giffen's book.

because it supplies us with raw materials and food. Only about *one-tenth* of our imports consist of manufactured articles—forty millions out of three hundred and seventy-nine millions.

Again, in computing the apparent difference between our payments to and our receipts from foreign countries, people lose sight of the fact, that English capital being invested all over the globe, in foreign loans, industries, and mercantile advances, all foreign countries pay and remit to England, in one form or another, the interest of this invested capital, amounting to very large sums, probably not less than seventy millions a year. A large portion of this interest arrives in the shape of marketable goods, imported for the benefit of the people of this country. That is the tribute, and the only tribute, which India, the colonies, and foreign nations pay to us, and it is paid for the use of our capital, by which both parties are gainers. So also, every Englishman who makes a fortune abroad and remits it to his native country, must do so in the form of commodities of some sort, which figure in the amount of our imports. An excess of imports is a sign not of poverty, but of wealth.

Simple as the foregoing propositions are, and they embody the whole theory of free trade, they are not yet universally apprehended. The fallacies of the mercantile theory and the balance of trade are still deeply rooted in the masses, and in the minds of some who ought to know better. The manufacturing classes adopted these principles because they believed that cheap food would tend to lower wages; the agricultural classes submitted because the same freedom was conceded to the import of all manufactured articles. The advocates of free trade on broad and sound economic principles were doubtless a minority of the nation: perhaps they are so still. But the more imperious is the duty to resist by every possible means a relapse into the delusive policy of the mercantile system, which still, as we see with regret, has numerous advocates and proselytes both in the United States and in Europe. Freedom of trade is one of the principles to which the Liberal party is irrevocably and absolutely pledged, though it may very well happen that the battle may have to be fought over again, and fought against the current of popular feeling. One of the arguments used by Mr. Goschen against the further extension of the franchise was, that it might render more difficult the defence of economic truths essential to the well-being of the country. Never, in truth, were the benefits of free trade more conspicuous to those who have eyes and brains than at this moment, when the failure of harvests and the depression of trade have caused great and

general depression and distress. What is it that prevents this distress from degenerating into disturbance, and this scarcity into famine, but the fact that the food of the people remains untaxed and cheap; that the markets of the world are open to the consumer; and that the State interposes no shadow of privilege or monopoly over any class of the Queen's subjects? To call this system 'short-sighted and impolitic' is to flatter the delusions of the most ignorant classes of the people.

We have already more than once intimated our opinion, that it is on the score of finance that the present Administration is most open to attack. Here it is that they have most widely departed from sound principles, which no one is better acquainted with than Sir Stafford Northcote himself. We applauded the measure he took, early in his term of office, for the regular reduction of the National Debt by setting apart a fixed sum of twenty-eight millions for the interest of the debt, the surplus being employed by the National Debt Commissioners. But the merit of that proposal has been annulled by the fact, that whilst he has been paying off debt with one hand, he has been contracting fresh debts with the other. Indeed it would seem that if the interest of the annuities and of the unfunded debt be taken into the account, the annual charge of the last two years exceeds twenty-eight millions, and there is no reduction of debt at all.* This is apt to be the fate of all sinking funds in times of emergency; and it can only be avoided by a vigorous determination to provide by the legitimate means of supply for the ordinary and extraordinary expenditure of each year. Mr. Gladstone's speech on the finances of the country, delivered in the course of his recent tour in Scotland, appears to us to be the most masterly display of his prodigious powers of versatility and eloquence. It left no point untouched or unattacked, and we only regret that it was not delivered in the House of Commons, which is the most appropriate field for such discussions. But Mr. Gladstone undoubtedly established (if any such proof were wanting) his complete command of the subject, and his unrivalled eminence as a financier. We can only hope that whenever a Liberal

* In justice to the Chancellor of the Exchequer it must, however, be said that he explained, in his speech at Leeds, that this apparent increase of the debt is due in part to the borrowing of money for the purpose of lending it again to public bodies without any charge to the State, and in part to the conversion of funded debt into terminable annuities, by which the principal will in a few years be discharged altogether.

Administration is called into being, the direction of the national finances will be placed in his hands to retrieve much that is amiss and to repress much that is exuberant; and it would be worthy of Mr. Gladstone's patriotism and magnanimity to devote himself to this most important and essential task, which no living man can perform equally well. In this, he would deserve and he would receive the cordial support and gratitude of the whole Liberal party; for we need hardly add, that a wise economy is one of its cardinal principles, and the experience of the last five years has proved how inseparable laxity of expenditure, jobbery, and rash speculation are from Tory government.

The views we entertain of the present state of Ireland and of the policy to be pursued in Irish affairs have been so fully stated in another part of this Number, that it is unnecessary to revert at length to the subject in this place. But we should fail to express an important principle of the Whig party if we did not state in the most emphatic manner that the traditions of the Whigs and the convictions of their present leaders are absolutely opposed to all measures tending to shake the solidity of the Union, to impair or divide the authority of the Imperial Parliament, or to flatter the wild dreams of the 'National' party in Ireland by any concession which should sever that island from the common legislation and policy of the United Kingdom. We might remind our critics that when O'Connell, at the height of his favour, raised the cry of 'Repeal,' he was encountered in argument with consummate ability by the Whig Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Spring Rice; and that when Irish agitation reached a height dangerous to life and property, the Whigs did not hesitate to pass the measures necessary for the defence of law and order, although of course these measures were fiercely attacked by their Irish allies and by not a few members of the advanced Liberal party. The Whig party desire to establish in Ireland complete equality of religious and civil rights, to extend and perfect the education of all classes and sects on Liberal principles, and to promote that prosperity in which Ireland has made no small progress in the last twenty years; but they object on principle to all relaxations of the authority of the law, to all attacks on the rights of property, and to the vicious theory that Irish discontent or sedition is to be bought off by grants from the Treasury. It may be true that in some English boroughs the Irish vote has acquired sufficient importance to turn an election, and that severe pressure has been put by the Home Rulers on some Liberal candidates to compel

them to accept the plausible proposal for a Committee of Enquiry into the claims of Ireland for Home Rule. The terms in which Mr. Shaw framed his motion were studiously moderate, with a view to catch English support, which would certainly have been refused to a more explicit resolution. But this artifice can impose on nobody. What is represented in England to be a mere vote for enquiry, is represented in Ireland to be a vote for Home Rule. This is one of the means by which the agitation is kept alive. On a question of vital importance to the existence of the State, it is a mean and treacherous action to disguise an opinion, or to court popularity by supporting a measure because it cannot be carried. A seat is purchased too dearly at such a sacrifice of honour and of truth. The people of England and Scotland will never consent to abandon Ireland to the revolutionary passions of a separate legislature; and whatever may be the equivocal language of the timid and the weak in the Liberal camp, this is a principle on which we are convinced that the leaders of the Whig party immovably stand.

The idea of the severance of the small islands which form the United Kingdom, and which are bound together by causes infinitely stronger than the passions which disunite them, is only worthy of men who would return to the Heptarchy. Nor is much more to be said for those who accept the specious plea of decentralisation, and would concede to Ireland a larger share of power over her local affairs. The limit of local power, whether parochial, municipal, or in counties, is soon reached. It is the limit of local taxation. As far as the control and application of local funds, raised by rates, to public purposes goes, nothing can be fairer or more desirable than local authority. Nobody contests to the Irish, the Scotch, and to every county and borough in England the entire management of their local business in as far as it is supported by local taxation. But at that limit their power stops. All Imperial taxation, and the control and application of all money raised by Imperial taxation, depend absolutely and exclusively on the House of Commons of the United Kingdom, and in that one proposition is comprised the whole secret of political power. Without the power of raising money from the people, no political body has any power at all. The power of raising the money without which government would cease to exist, comprises every other power. It is not conceivable that any British statesman would consent to transfer to an Irish assembly or political body the power of taxing the people of Ireland or of spending the money which Ireland contributes to the finances of the United Kingdom.

The case of the great colonies has no analogy, because they contribute nothing to the finances of the United Kingdom, and have no claim on the Treasury. But to sever the finances of Ireland from those of Great Britain is impossible, without breaking every tie between the two countries; and that is doubtless the object the Irish agitators have in view, for on no other hypothesis is their contention for independent political power consistent with sanity. For these reasons, amongst many others, we hold with Mr. Fawcett that it is better the Liberal party should be excluded indefinitely from office, than that it should purchase a brief and precarious official existence by any compromise at variance with sound economical and political principles, by which the Irish national leaders would not be satisfied—which they would accept, like O'Connell, only to contend for more—and by which the leaders of the Liberal party would be disgraced in the eyes of the people of Great Britain.

This, no doubt, is the most important subject to which the attention of statesmen and of Parliament can and will be directed. The old questions, 'How is Ireland to be governed?'—how is disaffection to be changed into loyalty, and division into union?—have lost none of their difficulty, although England has shown with no niggard hand that she is willing to make, and has made, all concessions to the just demands of the Irish people which are not inconsistent with the unity and existence of the Empire. But the Irish difficulty is not only great in itself, and might well demand the united efforts of British statesmen of all parties to solve it—for we are persuaded that Englishmen of all parties are equally disposed to treat Ireland with justice and perhaps with an imprudent liberality—but it lies at the threshold of all other legislation, and threatens to stop the course of parliamentary government. It is obvious that, if the same course of obstruction which originated with Mr. Parnell and his friends in the course of last session is to be pursued this year, the business of the House of Commons will be stopped and the character of Parliament still further lowered. And if, as is probable, the number of Home Rulers in the next Parliament is considerably increased, they being pledged to follow the same course, the evil will become one of the first magnitude. The Irish obstructionists, who have conducted their mischievous schemes with great ingenuity, soon found that a direct attack on the House by moving wanton adjournments and similar devices would be resented and punished as a contempt. They therefore took refuge in minute criticism. They claimed the right, which could not be con-

tested, of examining clause by clause and line by line every bill submitted to the House. Others took a lesson out of their book whenever they wished to defeat a Bill. The artifice is effectual. No important legislative Act, like the Bankruptcy Bill or the Criminal Code, can be passed if a considerable body of members combine to exercise their ingenuity in discussing every word the Bill contains. In such a state of things, to borrow the acute remark of the late Mr. Walter Bagehot, in his admirable essay on the House of Commons, 'It is not that 'you will not be able to do any good, but you will not be 'able to do anything at all. If everybody does what he thinks 'right, there will be 657 amendments to every motion, and 'none of them will be carried, or the motion either.'* Hitherto it has been assumed that the representatives of the people met in Parliament to pass laws, and that the will of the majority determined the result, and was accepted by the House and the country. But now it seems the representatives of the people, or some of them, are sent to Parliament to prevent laws from being passed. The minority is to rule the majority. Men are to exercise a power resembling the *liberum veto* of the Polish Diet. If this practice gains ground, it may be applied by all dissatisfied minorities to the bills of all governments. A Minister at the height of power would be baffled in his most important measures; the House of Commons would be reduced to impotence, and the duties of Parliament would be transferred to public meetings out of doors, to the press, and to the conflicting strife of popular opinion.

We need hardly say that this is a state of things which the country would regard as intolerable, and that the first and plainest of Whig principles is to maintain the authority of Parliament. Some of our more democratic allies, whether Irish or English, may not be sorry to see the authority of Parliament lowered, and questions decided by popular agitation and by a more direct appeal to popular meetings, in which electors and non-electors take an equal part. We regard such a shifting of power from the constitutional bodies which represent the nation to the irregular action of non-constituted political bodies as in the highest degree mischievous and deplorable, and we regret the increasing tendency of rival statesmen to carry on their political contests, out of the session, by frequent appeals to public opinion in these irregular forms, especially as these unanswered arguments and discussions are embittered by a large amount of personal recrimination. But

if the House of Commons cannot defend itself and enforce the rules necessary for the performance of its own duties, parliamentary government itself is lost, and the nation would cease to respect a body which should cease to be able to legislate for the country and to control its own members. We do not presume to recommend, or even at present to discuss, the measures which the wisdom and experience of the House can alone supply. The tactics of legislative assemblies are in themselves a science, which has been too little studied in theory since the days of Bentham and Dumont. The procedure of the House of Commons, complicated as it is, is wholly empirical, and has grown up by use. It is none the worse for that. But *salus populi suprema lex*. It is wholly impossible that technical artifices should be allowed to arrest the march of public affairs, or that the relations of the great parties which divide the realm of Britain should be placed at the mercy of an Irish faction. By some means or other—whether it be by a combination of the leaders of both parties, who have a common interest in maintaining the dignity and authority of the House of Commons, by a large addition to the authority of the Chair, or even by an appeal to the nation—the evil must be overcome; and we shall not be surprised if in the next session, and still more in the next Parliament, it assumes an importance paramount to all other matters. On this question, as on all others, the duty of the Whig party appears to us to be clear; it is to support moderate measures and a moderate policy, which we believe to be in accordance with the wishes and opinions of the great majority of the people of England, against the pretensions and agitations of extreme parties, and, whilst it opposes the rash and adventurous experiments of the present Administration, to control the demand for hasty and unnecessary innovations on the part of some of its own allies, whilst it continues to promote, as it did from 1830 to 1874, the pacific progress of the Empire and the liberties of the people.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

APRIL, 1880.

No. CCCX.

- ART. I.—1. *The Directorium Anglicanum*. Third edition. Edited by the Rev. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.C.L. London: 1866.
2. *The Priest's Prayer Book, with a Brief Pontifical*. London: 1870.
3. *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*. By the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A., F.S.A. London: 1876.
4. *Advice for those who exercise the Ministry of Reconciliation through Confession and Absolution, being the Abbé Gaume's Manual for Confessors*. With a Preface embodying English Authorities on Confession. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. London and Oxford: 1878.
5. *Ritual of the Altar: the Order of the Holy Communion, with Introits, Collects, Epistles, Graduals, Gospels, Offer-tories, Secrets, Communions, and Post-Communions throughout the Year*. According to the Use of the Church of England. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. Second edition. Revised and enlarged. London: 1878.
6. *Anglo-Catholic Principles Vindicated*. A Series of Original Treatises contributed by Eminent Prelates and Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by J. C. S. Second edition. London and Oxford: 1878.

FIFTY years ago it might have been alleged with truth that whatever other accusations were justly preferred against the clergy of the English Church, none could lay to their charge any proclivity towards the tenets of the Church of Rome. In the year 1833 the 'Tracts for the Times' began

to make their appearance. In the year 1841 the University of Oxford and the English Church at large were aroused and alarmed by the publication of Tract No. XC. About the same time Dr. Pusey commenced the publication of certain books of devotion which, according to the testimony of Dr. Hook, 'led men to Rome.' In the month of February 1845, Mr. Oakeley, then Senior Fellow of Balliol College, in a letter addressed to the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, claimed 'the right of holding, as distinct from teaching, *all Roman doctrine*, and that,' he adds, 'notwithstanding my subscription to the *Thirty-nine Articles*.' In the month of October in the same year, Mr. (now Cardinal) Newman was received into the Roman Church, and Mr. Browne, one of the converts to Romanism from the English clergy, writing in the year 1861, asserts that the school 'formed by the "*Tracts for the Times*" had given more than two hundred of the clergy, and many thousands of the laity, to the Church.' The prognostication of the late Bishop Thirlwall, in his masterly charge of 1866, that 'this ritual movement has by no means reached its term,' has been abundantly verified; inasmuch, indeed, that notwithstanding the inferiority of the Ritualistic clergy in numbers, in learning, and in ecclesiastical position, they have been able to set at defiance the decisions of the highest courts of appeal, and have reduced the Established Church of this land to a state approaching anarchy.

The agencies which have been employed in the accomplishment of this object have been mainly the three following: (1) An adroit use of the pulpit and the platform; (2) the adoption of a highly ornate and attractive ceremonial; and (3) the extensive circulation of a liturgical and devotional literature, in which the doctrines and practices of the pre-Reformation Church have been earnestly, and in many cases unscrupulously, inculcated.

It is the last of these three agencies with which a critical journal is chiefly concerned, and it is to the examination of the character of this literature that we propose to address ourselves in the following pages, adverting to the other agencies which we have specified only so far as they are connected with that to which we now invite the attention of our readers.

We propose to examine the general character of Ritualistic literature, as fully as our limits will allow, under the following heads:—

- I. The 'Sacrament of the Altar,' or the 'Mass.'
- II. Non-communicating Attendance for the purpose of assisting at a Sacrifice and for Adoration.

III. The Obligation of Fasting Communion.

IV. Sacramental Confession and Absolution.

V. The Observance of Unauthorised Festivals, and the Invocation of Saints and Angels.

VI. Hymnology.

And here it may be well to premise that, in addition to the ordinary difficulties which attend the investigation of the doctrines and the ceremonies of any sect or party, the task which lies before us in regard to the teaching of Ritualism is encompassed with peculiar difficulties, of which the advocates of that system are not indisposed to take the utmost advantage. In the first place, although the Ritualists constitute a more compact and a better organised body than any other school which now exists within the pale of the English Church, they have few, if any, leaders by whose writings the party, as such, is content to be judged. Many both of their earlier and of their later leaders—to their honour be it spoken—have withdrawn from the communion of a Church whose doctrines they had ceased to hold, and with whose ritual they were no longer content, for one whose creed they had gradually, and in some cases insensibly, adopted, and whose ceremonial satisfied their cravings after a sensuous form of worship. And further, the theory of development has been carried to such lengths by those who, to adopt the language of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, have remained with us ‘in order that they may substitute the ‘Mass for the Communion,’ that the position which was originally occupied by the leaders of the movement has been long since abandoned by the greater number of their followers. The combined result of these circumstances is not only that the founders of the Oxford school can no longer be regarded as the exponents of the creed or ritual of their disciples, but that the Ritualists of the present day are able to repudiate, whenever it may be found convenient, the authority of those who were at one time confessedly their guides.

We have a further difficulty to encounter in the performance of the task which we have undertaken. It is well known to those who have had to deal with Ritualistic literature, not only that the writers are in the habit of taking their quotations at second hand, and, as the result of that habit, of misunderstanding and misrepresenting the meaning of the authors whom they cite, but also that they are accustomed to employ language in an ambiguous sense, and not unfrequently in a sense wholly different from that in which it was originally used. This remark applies, in a special manner, to the Eucharistic controversy. Language which, in the writings of the early

fathers, of the great divines of the English Church, and, we may add, in the hymnology of orthodox Nonconformists, was designed to be understood in a figurative sense, is employed by writers of the Ritualistic school in a sense not only different from, but wholly inconsistent with, that in which it was originally used.

These, then, are some of the difficulties which we have to encounter in the execution of our design. If we quote from the works of those who are supposed to be amongst the leaders of the Ritualistic school, we shall be met by the objection that the individual writers alone are responsible for the doctrines which are taught, or the practices which are enjoined. If we quote from the works of those who were confessedly foremost in the Ritualistic movement, but who have now found their more congenial element in the Roman Church, we shall be met by the allegation that, whatever the position which they formerly occupied, they are no longer to be regarded as exponents of the views of those with whom they have ceased to identify themselves. And, once more, if we adduce language which, when taken in the connexion in which it stands, and when interpreted by the practices which it is designed to recommend, is manifestly inconsistent with the formularies of the English Church and with the creeds of the Reformed Churches generally, we shall expose ourselves to the retort that the same or similar language may be adduced from the writings of the early fathers, of the great divines of the English Church, and even from those of orthodox Dissenters.

In the face of these and other difficulties, which we shall not pause to enumerate, we proceed to address ourselves to the work which we have in hand; and although we entertain no expectation of convincing those whom the influence of sacerdotalism or the love of æsthetics has entangled in the meshes of Ritualism, we hope to make it manifest to those who are open to conviction that the doctrines and practices of the Ritualists are altogether alien from the spirit of Protestantism, and are utterly irreconcilable with a loyal adhesion to the formularies of the Reformed Church of England.

I. Our first enquiry is, What is the teaching of Ritualism on the subject of the Eucharist, or, to adopt Ritualistic phraseology, 'the Sacrament of the Altar'? Some years ago we should have been compelled to enter upon the investigation of many subtle and discordant theories in order to arrive at any definite conclusion on the subject of our present enquiry; and, in the issue, we should have been constrained to sum up that conclusion in the words, *Quot homines tot sententiæ*. Now

it is far otherwise. Little is now heard either of the loud protests which were formerly uttered against the dogma of transubstantiation, or of the subtle distinctions by which it was attempted to justify the allegation that the doctrine of the Ritualists differs in some material respects from that of the Church of Rome. It is virtually, if not formally, conceded, that in regard to the doctrine of the Mass the Romanists and the Romanisers are at one; and it is even alleged, with an amount of assurance at which the author of Tract No. XC. must stand amazed, that there is no real distinction on this subject between the formularies of the Church of England and those of the Church of Rome.

Our readers will naturally and reasonably demand some proof of an assertion which, if it cannot be fully sustained, deserves to be rejected as a gross and malicious libel. We have no need, however, either to encumber our pages with lengthened quotations, or to have recourse to the writings of the extreme left of the Ritualistic party, as the 'Tracts for the Day,'* in order to establish the truth of our assertion. We have before us, as we write, a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury by Canon Carter, who is deservedly esteemed as one of the ablest and most accomplished members of the party to which he has attached himself, and who, until a very recent date, was not regarded in the light of an extreme partisan. In a thoughtful and suggestive paper by the present Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, entitled 'Some Present Dangers of the Church of England,' the writer charged the Ritualists with teaching 'a doctrine of the Real Presence not substantially different from that set forth by the Church of Rome.' So far from denying the truth of this allegation, Canon Carter does not hesitate to write in the following words: "Substantially" there is no difference at all between us and the Church of Rome in regard to the Holy Eucharist.† Inasmuch, however, as we are now dealing with one of the vital questions of the Ritualistic controversy, and one on which our Reformers deemed that the difference between us and the Church of Rome was so great that they were content not only

* Thus, in the Tract on 'The Real Presence' we read as follows:—'In order to this union of the Flesh of Christ with ours, He first incarnates Himself in the hands of the Priest; i.e. at the moment of consecration Christ unites Himself, Body, Soul, and Divinity, in an ineffable manner, with the Elements of Bread and Wine.' (P. 16.)

† 'The Present Movement: A Letter to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. By the Rev. T. T. Carter, Rector of Clewer, Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.' Rivingtons, 1878.

to imperil but even to sacrifice their lives in the cause, it will be desirable (1) to state specifically what is the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject; and (2) to adduce some evidence corroborative of Canon Carter's assertion that there is no substantial difference between that of the Church of Rome and that which is now taught by the Ritualistic party in the Church of England.

In regard to the teaching of the Church of Rome it will suffice to adduce the following quotation from the Creed of Pope Pius IV., a creed which has ever been allowed to be an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman Catholic faith, and which is publicly recited by those who are admitted from other communions into the pale of the Roman Church :

'I profess that in the Mass is offered unto God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is really, truly, and substantially, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into His body, and of the whole substance of the wine into His blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation.'

Such being, on the highest authority, a summary of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as formally laid down in the decrees of the Council of Trent, and as still taught and received within the Roman communion, we shall proceed to adduce some evidence in proof of the truth of Canon Carter's assertion that the doctrine taught by the Ritualists is *substantially* identical with that of the Church of Rome.

This identity might, indeed, be fairly inferred from the servile and, in the eyes of Romanists, ludicrous mimicry of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Mass, which we find prescribed in Ritualistic directories, and which has been adopted, in defiance alike of law and of custom, in some English churches. It may be inferred with still greater certainty, from the reception on the part of certain Ritualists of the Roman 'Cautels' for the celebration of the Mass, which are described by Dr. Lee, in 'The Directorium Anglicanum,' as so valuable, 'as indicating the mind of our beloved Church in times gone by,' that they have been translated and published at length in the body of that work. Some of these 'Cautels' are of so loathsome and some of so puerile a character that we may well be excused from exposing them to the full measure of scorn and of ridicule which they are calculated to provoke. Of this character are those 'Cautels' which direct the priest what he is to do in the event of certain bodily infirmities or casual-

ties—how he is to cleanse the table or stand on which a drop of the consecrated wine may have fallen—to scrape the wood and burn the ashes—to suck the drop which may have fallen upon the altar, and to submit to three days' penance in expiation of his crime—or to do penance for forty days if a mouse or other animal should devour the Host.* The following extract from the third of these 'Cautels,' in which our readers will not fail to notice the introduction of the Roman doctrine of *intention*, will suffice to exhibit their true character, and at the same time to illustrate the views and aims of those who endeavour to leaven the Church with those corruptions of doctrine and practice which it was the object of the English Reformation to remove:—

'The third Cautel is: to read the Canon in a lower tone (*morosius*) than the other parts of the Liturgy. And especially from the place: *Qui pridie quam pateretur accepit*. For then the priest ought to fetch a breath and concentrate his attention, and to intend to collect his whole self (if he has not been able to do so before), upon each separate word. And whilst he shall say: *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes*; he shall fetch a breath and with one inspiration shall say (the words) *Hoc est enim corpus meum*. . . . Also in pronouncing the words of consecration over any matter, the priest should always intend to perform that which Christ instituted, and the Church does.' †

Another work of a similar character to the 'Directorium Anglicanum,' and one which, as we believe, is still held in high repute amongst Ritualists, notwithstanding the secession of its editor to the Church of Rome, is Mr. Orby Shipley's 'Ritual of the Altar.' ‡ The title of this work deserves notice as affording a characteristic illustration of the manner in which the minds of the clergy and the laity are gradually familiarised with Roman doctrines and ceremonies under the guise of conformity with the teaching of the Church of England. It is as follows:—'Ritual of the Altar. The 'Order of the Holy Communion, with Introits, Collects, Epistles, Graduals, Gospels, Offertories, Secrets, Communions, and Post-Communions throughout the year. According to the Use of the Church of England.'

The principle which has been adopted in this and similar

* Directorium Anglicanum, pp. 114, 115. Thomas Bosworth, 1866.

† Ibid. pp. 107, 108.

‡ Thus, e.g., 'The Kalendar of the English Church' for 1880, published by the Church Printing Company, gives a general summary of Ritualistic directions respecting the administration of 'Low' and 'High Mass,' and refers its readers for 'more minute information' to Mr. Orby Shipley's 'Ritual of the Altar,' p. 47.

works of enlarging the Book of Common Prayer from pre-Reformation sources is explained and justified in the preface to the 'Ritual of the Altar,' in the following words:—

'The order of the Prayer Book, both in text and rubric, has been literally followed; and everything devotional and ceremonial which it contains has been carefully reproduced. But from the circumstances of its origin, the history of its formation, change and restoration, and the mould in which the results hardened, the form of the English office can only be allowed to be, liturgically speaking, the *minimum* of a valid offering of the highest act of Christian worship. As such it has been treated in this volume. The right has been claimed and exercised of supplementing such order from the ancient rituals of the Church. Whatever Catholic custom is wont to use in Divine service, whether in word or act, which has not been distinctly disallowed by the Prayer Book, or some other authoritative document, or which has only been omitted without being prohibited, is still the legitimate inheritance of the Anglican Communion.' *

The way being thus prepared for unauthorised additions to the rites and ceremonies of the Book of Common Prayer, the volume before us carries out the principle which its editor propounds, not only by elaborate directions, illustrated by costly plates, for the use of various ornaments of the church and the ministers thereof, which the highest courts of the land have declared to be illegal, but also by the introduction of services for days which find no place in the Calendar of the English Church, and by the use of a phraseology which, however familiar to members of the Church of Rome, is alien from the simplicity of the ritual of the Church of England. Thus, we find elaborate directions about the 'slippers,' the 'amice,' the 'alb,' the 'girdle,' the 'maniple,' the 'chasuble,' and the 'biretta,' whilst as regards the rites and ceremonies connected with the celebration of 'the mass' we find mention of the 'mensa,' the 'super-altar,' the 'cross or crucifix,' the 'corporal,' the 'linen pall,' the 'water-cruet,' the 'purificator,' the 'censer,' the 'ciborium,' the 'Sanctus bell,' the 'reserved sacrament,' and the 'mass for the dead.'

It might, indeed, be supposed, notwithstanding the evidence which exists to the contrary, that elaborate works, such as the 'Hierurgia Anglicana,' the 'Directorium Anglicanum,' and the 'Ritual for the Altar,' were designed rather for the benefit of the ecclesiastical student than for the guidance of the parochial minister; in any case, that the rites and ceremonies which are explained and illustrated in these and similar works

* Preface to the 'Ritual of the Altar.' Second edition. Longmans, 1878.

were intended to be of exceptional observance, and that it would be unfair to draw any inference from such sources as to the changes which the Ritualists desire to introduce into the parish churches of our land. It is important, therefore, that we should extend our enquiry and ascertain what are the character and design of the liturgical and devotional books which are commonly circulated by the upholders of Ritualism, both for the general direction of the clergy and also for the instruction of the laity.

The first book to which we shall refer with this object is one which bears the title of 'The Priest's Prayer Book, with a 'brief Pontifical.' We quote from the fourth edition, 'much enlarged,' which was published by Mr. Masters in 1870. This volume is described in the preface 'as an appendix to the 'Book of Common Prayer, and to provide the parochial 'clergy with offices and collects for those occasional ministrations for which no formal or authorised provision has been 'made.' We are informed in the same preface, in language which is worthy of the school from which this volume emanates, that 'the object of the "Priest's Prayer Book" is not to *supersede* 'the use of the *Book of Common Prayer*, but to be merely ancillary and subordinate to it.' In what manner and to what extent that object has been accomplished our readers will infer from the following facts. Under the head of 'Prayers while 'vesting for the Holy Communion,' we find a series of short prayers, taken from the Roman Missal, to be used at washing the hands and whilst putting on the amice, the alb, the girdle, the maniple, the stole, and the chasuble. We find also a 'Direction of Intention before Celebrating,' and prayers to be used 'on mixing water with the wine,' 'on offering the 'bread and the chalice,' also a form of 'benediction of the 'incense as a *solemn service*,' a prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the sacrifice inserted *before* the Prayer of Consecration, and a prayer (again taken from the Roman Missal) to be used 'after the Consecration Prayer,' in which the consecrated elements are again offered to the Father as 'a 'pure, holy, and spotless sacrifice.'

The same doctrines and ceremonies are inculcated in the cheap and popular books of devotion which are now being circulated amongst Ritualistic congregations. Thus, in the 'Little Prayer Book,'* *revised and corrected by three priests, and intended chiefly for beginners in devotion*, of which ten thousand copies appear to have been circulated in 1872, when

* London, G. J. Palmer, 1872.

'the priest offers the bread and wine on the altar,' the people are taught to pray in these words: 'Receive, O Eternal Father, this offering, which is now only bread and wine, but will soon, by a miracle of Thy grace, become the true body and blood of Thine only Son' (p. 18). And again we find, on the same page, the following extract: 'At the words, "THIS IS MY BODY, THIS IS MY BLOOD," you must believe that the bread and wine become the Real Body and Blood with the Soul and Godhead of Jesus Christ.' And again, the following directions are given to those who communicate: 'Kneel up-right at the altar, and when the priest comes to you hold the palm of your right hand open and your left hand crossed under it; be most careful to receive into your mouth all, even the smallest portion, of the Most Holy Sacrament, since one Crumb or Drop of It is worth more than the world itself' (p. 40). We make no further comment upon these words.

In like manner, in 'The People's Mass Book,'* the object of which is 'to develope and perfect amongst the faithful laity of the English communion the worship of sacrifice,' we find not only various directions for prayers to be used *when the altar is incensed and the priest incenses the oblata*, and 'In Mass for the Dead,' but also the following significant note immediately after the Prayer of Consecration:—'The Rubric of the first book of King Edward VI. forbidding any elevation or showing of the sacrament to the people is omitted in our present Liturgy' (p. 45). † Again, after the insertion of the Prayer of Oblation, which is taken, as in the 'Priest's Prayer Book,' from the Roman Missal, and directions concerning the commemoration of the departed, the recital of the 'Agnus Dei,' and the portions which are to be said or omitted at 'Mass for the dead,' we find the following 'Instruction:—'Men must not think less to be received in part (of the sacred host) than in the whole; but in each (part) the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ' (p. 49).

* London, J. H. Batty. Second edition, fourth thousand, 1875.

† Our readers will do well to notice the characteristic adroitness of this reference, as also of a similar reference in 'The Ritual Reason Why' (p. 146), to the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI., a book which is commonly represented by the Ritualists as one of the highest authority, and to the usages of which in most particulars they would gladly revert. A similar use is made of the omission of the condemnation of non-communicating attendance at the administration of the Holy Communion, to which reference is made at page 293 of this article.

Of a similar character are the aids to devotion which have been provided for the 'faithful laity' in 'The Altar Manual'* and in 'The English Catholic's Vade-Mecum,'† whilst 'The Ritual Reason Why'‡ explains and illustrates the details of Ritualistic worship so far as it was developed in the year 1866, and 'The Server's Mass Book,'§ which was published twelve years later, contains full instructions for the use of 'altar boys,' when and where to put on their 'sanctuary shoes,' and directs them to 'wash the tips of their own fingers,' and to pour 'a few drops' over those of the priest, to 'be ready' with the Sanctus bell, and, at the Prayer of Consecration, to ring it three times.

But the proof of the substantial identity of the doctrine of the Mass, as taught by the Ritualists, with that of the Church of Rome does not depend merely upon the introduction into the English Church of rites and ceremonies which are borrowed from Roman sources, or upon the insertion of Popish prayers in popular manuals of devotion which are put forth by anonymous and therefore irresponsible individuals. The same doctrine is propounded under the auspices of the most highly accredited writers of the Ritualistic school. Thus in the 'Treasury of Devotion,'|| edited by Canon Carter, we find the following words:—'Jesu, our wonderful God, who vouchsafest to be present upon the altar when the priest pronounces the words of consecration' (p. 110). Again, in the 'Devotions for Holy Communion,'¶ edited by the same writer, we find the following directions: 'After the Consecration of the Bread, say, "Sacred Body, true Body of my Lord Jesus Christ! I worship Thee, I adore Thee!"' And: 'After the consecration of the chalice, say, "Sacred Blood of my Lord Jesus Christ! I worship Thee, I adore Thee!"' (pp. 128, 129). Again, in the edition of Scupoli's 'Spiritual Combat,' edited by Dr. Pusey,** we read thus: 'This weapon (i.e. the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist) is the very flesh and blood, joined to the soul and divinity, of Christ' (p. 134). In his elaborate treatise on 'The Real Presence,'†† Dr. Pusey expends no inconsiderable amount of labour, and displays no

* Thirty-fifth thousand. G. J. Palmer, 1877.

† Fourth edition. G. J. Palmer, 1874.

‡ The Ritual Reason Why. Edited by Charles Walker. J. T. Hayes, 1866.

§ T. Masters & Co., 1878.

|| Rivingtons, 1878.

¶ James Parker & Co., 1875.

** Messrs. Parker & Co., 1873.

†† John Henry Parker. Oxford and London, 1857.

small degree of ingenuity, in his attempt to reconcile his own doctrine of the presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood in the consecrated elements with the language of the so-called *black Rubric*, which states that 'the natural body and blood 'of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, *and not here*,' and he vainly seeks to prove that the word *corporal*, which occurs in the same place, must refer to the *mode* and not to the *fact* of Christ's presence, i.e., to quote his own words, that the bishops 'did not deny "the Presence of Christ's natural Body and "Blood,"' but that they denied that they 'were there "corporally,"' i.e., 'after the manner of a body' (p. 224). It is refreshing to turn from this and from similar evasions of the plain meaning of the Declaration concerning kneeling, which are but reproductions of Bellarmine's gloss on the words of St. Bernard, to the language of a writer who is not unfrequently adduced as a witness in support of views which none more ably exposed or more conclusively refuted. Bishop Jeremy Taylor, in his treatise on the real presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament, writes thus: 'We say that Christ's 'body is in the sacrament really but spiritually. They (i.e. 'the Romanists) say it is there really but spiritually. . . . 'Where now is the difference? Here by *spiritually* they mean 'present after the manner of a spirit; by spiritually, we mean 'present to our spirits only.'*

It would be a fruitless expenditure of time and labour to point out at length the utter incompatibility of the doctrine of the Eucharist as held by Romanists and Ritualists with that which is set forth in the Communion Office, the Articles, and the Homilies of the English Church, and which has been received and expounded by the great divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The following extract from the twenty-seventh of the Articles of Religion will supersede the necessity of adducing further evidence in support of this assertion:—

'Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is *repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament*, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the supper, *only after an heavenly and spiritual manner*. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith.'

If any further explanation be required of the sense in which the English Church receives the doctrine of 'the real pre-

* Works, by Heber, vol. ix. p. 428, 1822.

'sence,' it may suffice to quote the following words of the late Bishop of Exeter, to whose authority Ritualists are not unfrequently in the habit of appealing:—'It is in this sense that the crucified Jesus is present in the Sacrament of his Supper, *'not in, nor with, the bread and wine, nor under their accidents, but in the souls of communicants;* not carnally, but effectually and fruitfully, and therefore most really.'*

II. We have dwelt at considerable length upon the Ritualistic doctrine of the Eucharist, because it is one which lies at the very foundation of that Romeward movement which is now threatening the dissolution of the English Church as a national institution, and because it is the keystone to that theory of sacerdotalism which it is the persistent aim of Ritualism to establish. We shall now proceed, as was proposed, to notice the teaching of Ritualism in regard to attendance at the Eucharist for the purpose, not of communion, but of sacrificial worship and the adoration of the consecrated elements.

And here it is important to observe that the very strong language in which non-communicating attendance at the administration of the Lord's Supper was condemned in the second Prayer Book of King Edward VI., and in the subsequent revisions of the Book of Common Prayer in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and of King James I., was withdrawn at the last revision of that book in 1661. Few, we presume, who have not some ulterior object in view, will doubt that the reason why that condemnation was withdrawn is to be found in the fact that before the middle of the seventeenth century the leading principles of the Reformation were firmly established, and that there were no longer found at the administration of the Communion those who desired to 'stand by as gazers and lookers on them that did communicate, and who were not partakers of the same themselves.' Be this as it may, it is an admitted fact that there exists in our present Prayer Book no positive prohibition of the presence of non-communicants at the time of the celebration of the Lord's Supper; and we are free to allow that circumstances may, and occasionally do, occur, under which such attendance is not only lawful but expedient. Now the Ritualists, with their characteristic sagacity in taking advantage of the letter of the law, and, we must add, with their equally characteristic disregard of the general scope and spirit of the formularies of the English Church, nay more, of the very letter of one of her Homilies,† have availed

* Letters to Charles Butler, p. 121. John Murray, 1866.

† In 'The First Part of the Sermon concerning the Sacrament' we

themselves of this omission to convert a *sacrament* which was instituted in memory of Christ's death, and by the actual participation in which the faithful obtain the benefits of His passion, into a *sacrifice* for the living and the dead, in which He is alleged to be offered again as a victim, and at which the worshippers are to be present for the purpose of adoration, and not of communion. Proof of this charge is ready furnished to our hands, as will appear from the following extracts, which might be indefinitely multiplied.

Our first quotation shall be from the 'Directorium Anglicanum':—

'In the book of 1552 the Puritan party introduced a sentence of exclusion, which was withdrawn when the Prayer Book was last revised by the Church's representatives in 1662, when it again became legal, right, and proper for all who were in the Church's communion to take part on all occasions in the Eucharistic sacrifice.' (P. 63.)

We must now proceed to enquire what is meant in Ritualistic phraseology by 'taking part on all occasions in the Eucharistic sacrifice,' and with this view we shall refer first to 'The Altar Manual,' a book which is extensively circulated amongst the Ritualists. We learn from this manual that 'the four ends with which the sacrifice is offered to God' are the following:—(1) An act of adoration; (2) as a sacrifice of thanksgiving; (3) as a sin-offering for our pardon; and (4) as an act of supplication for mercies. In answer to the question, 'If we are not going to communicate, ought we to go out of the church before the Communion?' the answer is, No; we should stay to worship our Lord, even if we are not about to receive His body and blood, and should never leave at any rate until after the consecration, because the sacrifice is not offered at all until then' (p. 161).

Again, in the 'Little Prayer Book,' the following words are put into the mouth of 'those who assist at the holy sacrifice, but do not communicate: 'O Almighty Father, behold, I, an unworthy sinner, come before Thee to offer by the hands of Thy priest the sacrifice of the holy body and precious blood of Thy dear Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;' after which those who thus assist at the sacrifice are recommended to '*name their special intention*' in thus 'attending the celebration of the most holy Sacrament of the Altar' (p. 17).

read as follows: 'We must then take heed, lest, of the memory, it be made a sacrifice; lest, of a communion, it be made a private eating; lest, of two parts, we have but one; lest, applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive.' (P. 396.) Oxford, 1844.

So, once more, in the 'English Catholic's Vade-Mecum,' the non-communicant is taught an 'act of spiritual communion,' in which he prays, 'although not about to receive his Saviour sacramentally,' that he may 'unite himself to His sacred heart by faith, hope, and charity' (p. 22).

It is obvious that this teaching involves three distinct assumptions: (1) that the English Church recognises an altar on which a material sacrifice is offered; (2) that she has a sacrificing priesthood, whose function it is to offer that sacrifice; and (3) that that sacrifice consists of the elements of bread and wine, which are alleged, upon consecration, to become the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, and which, as such, are offered as a propitiatory sacrifice to the Father. Let us see how far any warrant for these assumptions can be derived from 'The Book of Common Prayer' and from the 'Articles of Religion.'

And here we observe, in regard to the first of these assumptions, that the word *altar*, which was exclusively used in the Missal, and which was retained in the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI., A.D. 1549, and that with special reference (as will appear on an examination of the places in which the word occurs) to its sacrificial aspect, was purposely eliminated from the second Prayer Book of King Edward VI., A.D. 1552, and that it has not been restored in any of the subsequent revisions of that book. When this fact is viewed in connexion with the Order in Council, A.D. 1550, for the taking down of altars and the placing of communion tables in their stead, little doubt can, we think, exist in the minds of those who are not impervious to conviction that the change of phraseology implied a change in the doctrine which was designed to be taught, and that from the year 1552 downwards the revisers of the English Prayer Book have purposely abstained from the recognition of a sacrificial altar as required for the worship of the English Church.

Again, it will be admitted on all hands that a sacrificing priesthood is the logical correlative of a sacrificial altar, and, consequently, that if, as we have already shown, the latter has no existence in the English Church, it will follow as a necessary consequence that no scope can be afforded for the exercise of the functions of the former. On this point, however, we have other reasons than those of logical consistency for the belief that the English Church does not recognise the existence of a sacrificial priesthood. It is true, indeed, and ample use has been made of the fact, that the English word *priest* corresponds to the Greek word *ιερεύς* as well as to *πρεσβύτερος*,

and to the Latin word *sacerdos* as well as to *presbyterus*. It will not, however, we think, be difficult to ascertain in which of the two significations of which the word is capable it has been retained in the Book of Common Prayer. For (1) whereas in the Roman Church the ordination of priests is effected by the delivery into their hands of the chalice and the paten, and the recital of the words, ‘*Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missasque celebrare, tam pro vivis, quam pro defunctis,*’ no such words are to be found in the ordinal of the English Church, and no such power is claimed on behalf of any of her ministers. And (2) whereas in the thirty-first of the Latin Articles of A.D. 1571, which are of equal authority with the English, the word *sacerdos* is used in reference to Roman priests, who were said to ‘offer Christ for the ‘quick and dead,’ in the only place in which it is used in the Articles of Religion in reference to the ministers of the English Church, viz. in the title to Article XXXII., we find it employed, not in its sacrificial signification, but as comprehending the three orders of bishop, priest, and *deacon*. In the same sense, it may be observed, the word *priest* appears to be used in the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, in the Litany, in the Baptismal and Burial Services, in the Form of Solemnisation of Matrimony, and in the Churching of Women, in all of which services deacons are accustomed to officiate, and in regard of some of which it is declared to appertain to their office either ‘to assist the priest,’ or to minister ‘in his ‘absence.’ Nor is it unworthy of remark that in the Scotch Prayer Book of 1637, in which Archbishop Laud was concerned, the word *priest* is interpreted throughout by *presbyter*.

If we have succeeded in our attempt to prove that the English Church recognises neither a sacrificial altar nor a sacrificing priesthood, we shall need but little evidence that she does not regard the consecrated elements in the light of a material sacrifice. It may fairly admit of doubt whether the Prayer Book of 1662 does, or does not, regard the *unconsecrated* elements of bread and wine as *oblations* which she asks that God would accept. For our own part we are by no means prepared to admit that the elements are meant by the word *oblations* in the Prayer of Consecration. It is true, as regards the prayer that God would ‘accept our alms and oblations,’ that the word *oblations* was introduced at the same time with the direction to the priest to place the bread and wine upon the table previously to the use of the prayer in which these words occur. The following facts, however, must not be overlooked:—(1) No mention is made of any oblation

of the elements between 1552 and 1661; and we are informed by Dr. Hickes, who strongly maintained the significance of the action, that the custom of placing the elements on the table at this time had been 'almost never observed in cathedral or parochial churches'—a very singular omission if the doctrinal theory of the oblation of the elements had been generally recognised in the English Church. (2) The proposal of Sancroft, at the last revision, to alter the Rubric thus, 'The priest shall then *offer up* and place upon the table so much bread and wine,' &c., was not adopted. (3) Whereas 'the priest is directed *humbly* to present and place' the alms upon the table, he is directed only to 'place upon the table so much bread and wine,' &c. (4) When there is no administration of the Communion, but alms or oblations are collected and placed upon the table, the priest is required by the terms of the Rubric to use the words, 'accept our alms *and* oblations.' Lastly, at the same time at which the word *oblations* was introduced, the words, 'other devotions of the people,' to which Dr. Cardwell considers that the word *oblations* refers, were introduced in addition to *alms*.*

But whether the English Church does or does not recognise an oblation of the *unconsecrated* elements of bread and wine, it is more than abundantly clear that she recognises no oblation of the *consecrated* elements, as the body and blood of Christ. The evidence in support of this assertion is so ample that our limits will admit only of the production of a very small portion of the materials which we have collected. And (1) we know that Cranmer was one of the principal agents in framing the Liturgy of 1552, which, as regards the Communion Office, remains substantially unchanged in the later revisions; and, as Dr. Pusey admits, Cranmer had at that time 'gone over to the Swiss school.' (2) Although the word *Mass*, which is

* It is deserving of notice, in support of this explanation of the meaning of the word *oblations*, that in Bishop Wren's 'Orders and Directions given in the Diocese of Norwich' in 1636 we find the following: 'That the holy *oblations* in such places where it pleaseth God at any time to put into the hearts of His people to acknowledge His gift of all they have . . . be received by the minister, standing before the table at their coming up to make the said *oblation*, and then by him to be reverently presented before the Lord, and set upon the table till the service be ended.' (Cardwell's 'Documentary Annals,' ii. p. 205.) The distinction between alms for the poor and offerings for Church purposes appears to have been commonly recognised in the seventeenth century. See Robertson's 'How shall we conform to the Liturgy?' p. 394. Third edition, 1869.

found in the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI., has no etymological connexion with the idea of sacrifice, it can scarcely admit of doubt that it was eliminated from the Prayer Book of 1552, and from all subsequent revisions, on account of its association in the minds of the people with the Roman doctrine of a sacrifice for the living and the dead.* (3) The changes made in the Rubrics which relate to the position of the table, and of the priest in respect to it, are inconsistent with the notion of the offering of a sacrifice. (4) The emphatic declaration contained in the Prayer of Consecration that 'Christ, by His *one* sacrifice of Himself, *once offered*, made a 'full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction 'for the sins of the whole world,' excludes the Roman and Ritualistic doctrine of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass, whether as a repetition or as a perpetuation of the sacrifice of the cross.† And (5) the Prayer of Oblation which, in the Liturgy of 1549, *followed* the Prayer of Consecration, as in the Roman Missal, was removed in 1552 to the place which it now occupies, as an *alternative* prayer, in the *post-Communion* service; the words relating to the elements, 'the holy gifts, the 'memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make,' were, and still are, altogether omitted; and the only sacrifice of which mention is made is the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, together with the presentation of 'ourselves, our souls 'and bodies,' as 'a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto 'God.'‡

If any further evidence be desired that the English Communion Office recognises no sacrifice of the consecrated elements,

* See extract from the Last Charge prepared by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and published, after his death, in 'Anglo-Catholic 'Principles Vindicated,' p. 144.

† 'The Catholic Priest knows his office to be to perpetuate on the 'altars of the Church Militant on earth the same sacrifice which the 'Great High Priest consummated once on the cross.'—Preface to the 'Directorium Anglicanum,' p. x.

‡ The great importance which is attached by the Ritualists to the so-called 'Prayer of Oblation' will appear from the fact that Mr. Blunt seriously argues that so long as this prayer is used 'while any 'portion of the consecrated elements remains upon the altar' the 'ancient sacrificial act of the Church is literally and verbally continued 'in respect to that portion.' ('Annotated Book of Common Prayer,' p. 388.) It did not occur to Mr. Blunt, or it did not suit his purpose to remind his readers of the fact, that inasmuch as the priest is directed to place upon the table only 'so much bread and wine' as he 'shall 'think sufficient,' the revisers of 1661 could not have contemplated the oblation of the remaining portion of the consecrated elements.

as the body and blood of Christ, it will be found in the fact that for upwards of a century after the revision of A.D. 1552 it was ordered that the priest should have 'to his own use' whatever remained of the elements, *whether consecrated or unconsecrated*, a decisive proof that the English Church, during that period, recognised no such miraculous effect produced upon the elements by the words of consecration as that for which Ritualists now contend. The truth of this statement will appear from the following consideration. No manual actions were appointed to be used between A.D. 1552 and A.D. 1662. Hence, either the whole of the elements which were placed upon the table were deemed to be consecrated, or there was no consecration at all. Accordingly, the Rubric at the end of the service made no distinction between what was consecrated and what was not consecrated, but simply ordered that 'if any 'of the bread or wine remain the curate shall have it to his 'own use.' We think that the most advanced Ritualists will scarcely be prepared to maintain that the revisers of the Book of Common Prayer in A.D. 1552, A.D. 1559, and A.D. 1604, would have deliberately framed or continued such a direction, had the faith of the English Church then been that of the Ritualists of the nineteenth century, as we find it set forth in 'The Little Prayer Book: 'At the words "This is My "body, this is My blood," the bread and wine become the real 'body and blood, with the Soul and Godhead, of Jesus Christ.'

We shall not discuss the question whether the adoration addressed to 'the consecrated elements,' in the language of Mr. Bennett, or, as the Ritualists prefer to describe it, to 'Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of bread 'and wine,' is, or is not, to be regarded, as respects the individuals who render it, in the light of 'idolatry, to be abhorred 'of all faithful Christians.' If the doctrine for which the Ritualists contend be admitted, the obligation of the practice which follows is its legitimate result.

Under the head of 'Devotions for those who assist at the 'Holy Sacrifice, but do not communicate,' to which reference has already been made, after the paragraph which we have quoted at p. 290, beginning 'At the words, "This is My Body, "this is My Blood,"' &c., we read thus in the 'Little Prayer 'Book: '—

'Bow down your head and body in the deepest adoration when the priest says these Awful Words, and worship your Saviour, then verily and indeed present on His Altar: then say—

"Hail, True Body! born of Mary,
Spotless Virgin's virgin birth," &c.'

And again, as a specimen of the 'acts of spiritual communion' in which non-communicants are invited to engage, we select the following from 'The Altar Manual':—

'Soul of Christ, save me.
Body of Christ, save me.
Blood of Christ, inebriate me.
Water out of the side of Christ, wash me,' &c.

After which follows the hymn beginning thus:—

'Humbly I adore Thee, hidden Deity,
Which beneath these figures art concealed from me.' *

It would be easy, did our space allow, to multiply quotations in illustration of the teaching of Ritualism on the subject of non-communicating attendance at the celebration of the Eucharist. We have already adduced sufficient evidence of the extent to which this practice is encouraged, and of the nature of the worship in which those who do not purpose to communicate are invited to engage. The following extract, for which we are indebted to Dr. Pusey's edition of the Abbé Gaume's 'Manual for Confessors,' will illustrate the view which that learned professor has thought proper to communicate to the world respecting the benefit which is to be derived from this form of will-worship:—

'Clericato mentions having seen several sinners who were gifted with unusual contrition in their last hours; and when he investigated what had won so great a grace for such sinful men, he found that they had taken great pains to be present at Holy Communion, and been very devout thereat. Thus this Expiatory Sacrifice worked its result, and though late, the Divine Blood demanded their salvation, and obtained it.' †

Before we proceed any further in our examination of the character and tendency of Ritualistic Manuals of Devotion, we will commend to the consideration of our readers the two following protests, uttered by the late Bishop Wilberforce, against the doctrine and practice of non-communicating attendance at the administration of the Holy Communion, the one extracted from his last Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, and the other from an Address to the Rural Deans of the Diocese of Winchester:—

'Suffer me to name to you, as an instance of what I mean, one practice, the growth of which amongst us I view with great apprehen-

* Pp. 80, 81.

† The Abbé Gaume's 'Manual for Confessors,' with a Preface by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. James Parker & Co., 1878.

sion—I mean a tendency unquestionably manifested in certain quarters to change the idea of the Holy Eucharist from a Communion of the faithful into a function of the celebrating priest. Such a change is, in my most mature judgment, no lawful progress in increased reverence for that great Sacrament upon the lines of our own Church. I cannot but regard it as the adoption of the view, and therefore of the practice, of another Church, to whose doctrine as to the Holy Eucharist it naturally belongs, whereas it is absolutely subversive of that which has been received amongst ourselves. For, in strict agreement as we believe with the words of Holy Writ, and with the teaching of the primitive Church, we do not regard the Communion of the faithful as an accident of the Holy Eucharist, which may be added to it or separated from it at will, leaving the great function of intercession untouched by the omission, but as of the very essence of the Sacrament. So it was at the institution: “Take, eat; this is My Body.” The mysterious presence and the actual Communion are bound indissolubly together. So they are in St. Paul’s address to the Corinthian Church: “The bread that we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?” Such was the custom of those first Christians who came together on the first day of the week, not to see even an Apostle celebrate, but to break bread; to partake, that is, plainly themselves of the consecrated element. From this the solitary Mass of Rome is so absolutely unwarranted a deviation, that we can have no assurance that it does not altogether overthrow the very nature of the Sacrament. It is certain that this practice is most intimately connected, both as cause and consequence, with the greatest practical corruptions of the Papal Communion. Whatever, then, tends to its introduction amongst ourselves appears to me to threaten the existence of our whole religious system. Such tendencies I see in the attempt to make the celebrations of the Holy Eucharist at our principal Sunday Morning Service impressive, if not gorgeous, as a display, whilst the congregation are urged to remain through the service as spectators, but not to partake of the Sacrament as communicants. Such a tendency I detect in the multiplication of choral communions, where few members of the choir communicate. The very purpose for which these practices are recommended seems to me at variance with the true idea of the Eucharist; for effectual with God as we doubt not, through Christ our Lord, this great appointed act of the Church’s intercession is, I know no ground for supposing that prayer offered up by those who are present at the celebration but do not partake in it is one whit more prevailing than prayer at any other time or in any other place. Nor does it seem to me that a surrounding crowd of non-communicants adds any honour to the Sacrament. On the contrary, to remain and not to communicate seems to me to dishonour Christ’s institution, and to injure the soul of the worshipper. Far truer, far more reverent, far safer for the unprepared spirit, was the old warning, which, before the sacred mysteries, proclaimed to the unbaptised, to the catechumen, and to the unreconciled penitent, that he should depart.*

* ‘A.’ Charge delivered to the Diocese of Oxford at his eighth

We will only add to this extract the following still stronger words of earnest expostulation which were uttered by the same prelate a few days before his lamented death, when, after observing that this practice of non-communicating attendance was not an accident, nor a custom introduced for the purpose of making children better acquainted with the service, the bishop proceeded thus:—

‘But this is recommended under quite a different impression. It is under the idea that prayer is more acceptable “at this time of the sacrifice;” that you can get benefit from being within sight of the Sacrament when it is being administered. It is the substitution of a semi-materialistic presence for the actual presence of Christ in the soul of the faithful communicant. *It is an abomination*, this teaching of non-communicating attendance as a common habit.’*

III. We have next to consider the teaching of Ritualists on the obligation of Fasting Communion. It appears at first sight so preposterous that fasting should be inculcated as a duty with a view to the participation of a sacrament which was instituted in the evening ‘after supper,’ that those who are unacquainted with the rules prescribed in Ritualistic books of devotion may well demand proof that such a practice is therein enjoined as one of primary importance and of imperative obligation. The following extracts will suffice to show what the teaching of Ritualism is in regard to this subject.

As regards the ‘celebrating priest,’ the seventh ‘Cautel,’ which Dr. Lee, in the ‘Directorium Anglicanum,’ has translated for his benefit, is that he ‘do not wash his mouth or ‘teeth, but only his lips from without, with his mouth closed; ‘lest perchance he should intermingle the taste of water with ‘his saliva’ (p.109). The rules enjoined in Ritualistic manuals, in regard to lay communicants, are of different degrees of stringency. In the Tract on ‘The Seven Sacraments’ in the volume entitled ‘Tracts for the Day,’ we are told that ‘the ‘Church has ever ordered the reception of the Holy Eucharist ‘to be made fasting;’ and further, that ‘in our own Branch ‘of the Church the Canons and Injunctions to observe this ‘rule are very strict.’† In the ‘Little Prayer Book’ the rule is as follows:—‘Remember that you must receive the Holy ‘Sacrament FASTING—that is, you must neither eat nor drink

‘Visitation,’ November 11, 1869, by Samuel, Lord Bishop of Oxford, pp. 19, 20. James Parker & Co., 1869.

* Anglo-Catholic Principles Vindicated, p. 459. James Parker & Co., 1878.

† Tracts for the Day, p. 80. Longmans, 1868.

‘on your Communion day until you have received the Most Holy Sacrament’ (p. 31). Again, Mr. Grueber, in his ‘Worship according to Holy Scripture in the Church of England and the whole Catholic Church of Christ,’ in answer to the question ‘How should the (*sic*) Sacrament be received?’ replies thus: ‘Fasting. Such has been the general practice of the whole Church of God from apostolic times’ (p. 31). Not content, however, with the inculcation of the duty of Fasting Communion, the ‘Altar Manual’ proceeds to explain the rationale of the injunction in answer to the very natural enquiry, ‘Why should we fast before Communion if the Apostles did not at the first Eucharist?’ The answer affords a fair sample both of Ritualistic learning and of Ritualistic ingenuity. ‘The Apostles did come fasting to the Paschal Supper, which, itself a holy sacrifice, was on that occasion the first part of the new Eucharist’ (p. 145). It is needless, our readers will think, to multiply evidence. Let us pause for a moment to examine the passage last quoted.

It will strike every Bible student as a somewhat startling assertion that the Paschal Supper was ‘itself a sacrifice,’ and as a statement almost equally surprising that that sacrifice formed ‘the first part of the new Eucharist.’ Every theologian is well aware that it is a controverted point whether the Passover itself was, or was not, in the strict sense of the word, a *sacrifice*. We look in vain for any warrant for the assertion that the *Paschal Supper* was ‘itself a sacrifice,’ or that that supper constituted any part of the ‘new Eucharist.’ If the example of our Lord and of His apostles at the institution of the Eucharist is to be strictly carried out in regard to the Christian Passover, it would follow that a meal such as that of the Jewish Passover, or the Christian Agape, should always precede the administration of the Eucharist.

It does not fall within the province of a critical journal to express any opinion upon the subject of Fasting Communion, when regarded in the light of an exercise of personal devotion. In regard to this practice, viewed apart from its ritualistic concomitants, every man must determine for himself whether it be profitable or the contrary. But, on the other hand, when enjoined, as it now is by the Ritualists, as an imperative duty, and employed as a means of promoting attendance at the celebration of ‘High Mass’ at a later hour of the day, for the sake of adoration, not of communion, it becomes a duty to expose the true character and tendency of such teaching, as bringing discredit upon the original institution of the Lord’s Supper, and as fostering notions of a pernicious and

degrading tendency. Against such degrading notions Bishop Wilberforce, in the address to which reference has already been made, delivered the following emphatic protest:—

‘It is not in a light sense that I say this new doctrine of Fasting Communion is dangerous. The practice is not advocated because a man comes in a clearer spirit, and less disturbed body and mind, able to give himself entirely to prayer and communion with his God; but in a miserable, degraded notion that the consecrated elements will meet with other food in the stomach. *It is a detestable materialism.* Philosophically, it is a contradiction, because when the celebration is over you may hurry away to a meal, and the process about which you were so scrupulous immediately follows. The whole notion is simply disgusting.’

IV. Our next subject of enquiry is the teaching of Ritualistic Manuals of Devotion on the subject of confession and absolution, or, according to the phraseology which has recently come into fashion amongst the Ritualistic section of the English Church, on the subject of *sacramental confession*.

And here it will be well to premise that we shall not pollute our pages with citations from a work which of late has acquired an unenviable notoriety. It is entitled ‘The Priest in ‘Absolution: a Manual for such as are called unto the higher ‘Ministries in the English Church.’ The general character and contents of this book may be inferred with sufficient accuracy from the following words which we extract from the preface:—‘To prevent scandal arising from the curious or ‘prurient misuse of a book which treats of spiritual diseases, ‘it has been thought best that the sale should be confined to ‘the clergy, who desire to have at hand a sort of *Vade-Mecum* for easy reference in the discharge of their duties as ‘confessors.’*

It will suffice for the object which we propose to refer to such books as are not only open to the public at large, but some of which are widely circulated among persons of all ages and of both sexes. The teaching of ‘The Little Prayer Book’ on the subject of confession is as follows:—‘When you go to ‘Confession, remember two things, one about yourself, and ‘one about the priest. Firstly about yourself, remember that ‘confession will do you no good, but a great deal of harm, ‘unless you go with a firm resolution to confess *all* your wilful ‘sins.’ So again, in a ‘Guide to Confession’ entitled ‘The ‘Ministry of Consolation,’ we read as follows: ‘If in a confession of this (the alone true) nature, any single sin, how-

* Part II. p. viii. Privately printed for the use of the Clergy. Joseph Masters, 1866.

‘ever slight, be WILFULLY concealed or withheld, let the penitent understand at once that such a concealment were nothing less than an act of sacrilege.’*

Such teaching as this is inculcated upon children from their infancy. We quote from the ‘Second Catechism for the Children of the Church issued by the Church Sunday School Union.’†

‘Q. What is confession of sins?—A. To tell them one by one.

Q. Would it be wrong to keep back any sin in confession?—A. Yes, it would be a very grievous sin, and it would be lying to God.’ (Pp. 54, 55.)

Nor must it be thought that such teaching is restricted to the most extreme section of the Ritualists, or to the cheap and popular books which are circulated amongst the young and the ignorant. We turn from these to Dr. Pusey’s adapted edition of the Abbé Gaume’s ‘Manual for Confessors,’ a work, as we are informed in the title-page, ‘abridged, condensed, and adapted to the use of the English Church.’ Now, inasmuch as Dr. Pusey has selected the work of the Abbé Gaume from the numerous works of the same character which are in use in the Roman Church, and inasmuch, moreover, as he has presented this work to his readers in a form which is ‘adapted to the circumstances and principles of the Church of England,’ it is not unfair to conclude that this manual presents the doctrine and the practice of sacramental confession in such a manner as its editor deems most suitable to the present requirements of those for whose benefit it is published. The first thing which strikes us in the examination of this work is that, by the arbitrary distinction which it makes between mortal and venial sins, and by the indefensible theory which it propounds in order to guard the inviolability of the seal of confession, it strikes a death-blow at the very foundation of Christian morals. Thus, e.g., at p. 134, a thief is taught that ‘he only commits mortal sin when his thefts amount to a serious matter, supposing that such was not his intention from the first,’ whilst at p. 402 we read that, ‘as man,’ the confessor ‘may swear with a clear conscience that he knows not what he knows only as God.’

Such being the teaching of this manual in regard to theft and perjury, we shall not be surprised to find that it displays no small amount of indulgence in regard to the other sins of which it treats. We will take, by way of example, the

* The Ministry of Consolation, p. 57. Joseph Masters, 1854.

† Church Sunday School Union, Kilburn Park Road.

method of dealing which is recommended in regard to sins of the tongue, such as 'blasphemies, oaths, and injurious words.' At p. 289 we read as follows:—'You may absolve a penitent 'who, from the habit of using bad language six times a day 'or more, has come only to use it say once a day during a 'week; while you will do well to defer absolution to him 'who, from the habit of almost daily acts of sin, has come only 'to fall three times in the week.' And again: 'If you have 'persons full of faults, but who have need of speedy or instant 'absolution, as, e.g., if they are to be married on a certain 'day, or must set off on a journey, it has least peril to absolve 'them' (p. 170).

The general character of the teaching of this most mischievous book as to the circumstances under which absolution is to be given or withheld, and, we may add, the entire divergence of the book, both in doctrine and in phraseology, from the teaching of the English Church, may be collected with sufficient accuracy from the following passage:—'A layman living in 'habitual sin can be absolved whenever he has the necessary 'dispositions; but a candidate for holy orders must not only 'have those necessary to the Sacrament of Penance; he must 'also have the dispositions necessary to the Sacrament of 'Orders' (p. 304).

But it may be urged—and we freely admit the truth of the allegation—that it would be unfair to speak of the facility with which absolution may be obtained, in accordance with Ritualistic teaching, whilst no notice is taken of the penances which are imposed upon those who would obtain that benefit. We will therefore refer to a few of the penances which are mentioned with approval in the volume before us. At p. 33, St. Philip Neri is said to have reclaimed a profligate youth 'on whom he laid no heavier burden than daily to say a short 'prayer six times, and to kiss the ground, saying, "To-morrow ' "I may be dead." ' Again, at p. 52, 'one who has a habit of 'blasphemy' is recommended to 'make the sign of the cross 'several times on the ground with his tongue,' and 'daily to 'say some prayer, as an act of reparation.' Amongst the 'easy penances' recommended, the confessor is advised to prescribe 'five *Our Fathers* daily for some time' (p. 356); but, lest the confessor should fail to 'impose suitable penances' for grave sins, he is taught, at p. 365, that 'an *Our Father*' (we presume that one repetition is here intended) 'would be 'a very light penance for repeated adulteries or other im- 'purities' (p. 365).

In regard to the method of examination which is recom-

mended in this volume, notwithstanding Dr. Pusey's indignant denial of the truth of the accusations which have been preferred against him, we fear that, practically, his teaching must lead to the results which he so earnestly deprecates. Thus, e.g., the true fatherly confessor is represented, at p. 17, as thus encouraging the poor, the ignorant, and the greatest sinners. 'Courage!' such a one will say; 'do not be afraid; make a good confession. Tell me everything without restraint. Do not keep back anything through shame' (pp. 17, 18). Again, in p. 26, the example of St. François de Sales is thus held up for imitation:—'He liked people to be clear, simple, and unaffected in their confessions, telling his penitents that they must explain the motives which led to their faults, and that they must not confess carelessly, but lay bare all the sources and movements of their sins to their confessor, as, without so doing, their consciences could not be purified' (pp. 26, 27). Again, at pp. 151, 152, we read that 'the confessor should move the penitent to accuse himself of all the sins which he remembers, after which he will probably find it advisable to question him . . . always requiring the number of any mortal sins, either exactly or nearly.'* And with regard to sins of impurity we read thus:—'He must know to this end what circumstances change the kind, or aggravate it, *quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando.*' On the next page we find that the examination is to be continued with regard to 'impure thoughts or impressions.' We are unable to conceive of an examination more searching than that which is here recommended, and we are equally unable to reconcile the advice here given with the footnote which we find at p. 405 in regard to 'questions concerning purity: '—'I do not doubt that, under our circumstances, they should be omitted altogether.'

Nor is the examination of the conscience confined to the sins of the individual; for although, at p. 154, we read that the penitent is to be hindered, 'as far as possible,' from naming or indicating his companions in sin, we find, at p. 394, that he 'is bound to confess not only his own sins, but also those he may have caused others to commit.'

It would be easy, did our limits permit, to contrast the teaching of the popular books of Ritualistic devotion and of Dr. Pusey's edition of the Abbé Gaume's 'Manual for Confessors' with the teaching of the English Church as set forth in her

* In like manner it is prescribed in 'The Priest in Absolution' (Part I. p. 23) that 'the nature and number of sins should be asked.'

authorised formularies, and more especially as exemplified in the changes made in the second Prayer Book of King Edward VI., and as explained in the writings of the great divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The following quotation from 'the Second Part of the Sermon of Repentance,' which contains (as the thirty-fifth Article of Religion teaches) 'a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times,' will supersede the necessity of further evidence:—

'And when that they do allege this saying of our Saviour Jesus Christ unto the leper, to prove auricular confession to stand on God's Word; *Go thy way and shew thyself unto the priest*; do they not see that the leper was cleansed from his leprosy, afore he was by Christ sent unto the priest, for to shew himself unto him? By the same reason we must be cleansed from our spiritual leprosy, I mean our sins must be forgiven us, afore that we come to confession. What need we then to tell forth our sins into the ear of the priest, sith that they be already taken away? . . . It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not his warrant of God's Word, else it had not been lawful for Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, upon a just occasion, to put it down. . . . I do not say, but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and shew the trouble and doubt of their conscience unto them, that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God's Word: but it is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of blindness and ignorance.'

It is needless to point out how entirely remote in its character and in its design is the confession which is sanctioned in this Homily from that which is enjoined in Ritualistic books of devotion. Nor is there less diversity in the absolution which is contemplated in the one and that which is contemplated in the other. The confession of which this Homily speaks is restricted, as it is in the Book of Common Prayer, to the particular doubt or grief by which the conscience is troubled; it does not involve the categorical enumeration of every sin which is within the memory of the penitent; and it may be made not only to a *priest*, but to *some other godly learned man*. Again, the absolution to which the Homily refers is given, not by the rehearsal of some set form of words such as we find at page 48 of 'The Priest in Absolution,' authoritatively pronounced in the name of the Trinity, and accompanied by the sign of the cross, but by the 'ministry'* of

* The direction to use the form of absolution which is found in the

God's holy Word, i.e. by the application of that Word to the particular case of the penitent.*

Nor are there the same safeguards against abuses in the Ritualistic practice of sacramental confession which the Roman Church has provided both for her priests and for her people. We read, indeed, in Dr. Pusey's edition of 'The Manual for 'Confessors,' of ordinary vows which 'may be commuted by 'bishops,' and we read also that bishops 'can delegate their 'power to others.' We are not aware, however, that any Anglican confessors can lay claim to confessorial power, as delegated to them by their respective bishops, nor have we heard of any Anglican bishops to whom our modern confessors are in the habit of giving account of the manner in which their duties *as confessors* have been discharged. We are aware that Mr. Maskell, in a letter addressed to Dr. Pusey in the year 1850,† enquired whether the bishops of his own Church had afforded, or would afford, any sanction to his intrusion into dioceses in which he had no legal jurisdiction, and what the Bishop of Exeter, in particular, would say of the 'clandestine correspondence' which he was said to carry on with his penitents, 'against the known will of their parents' and for the purpose of hearing confessions, and of the secret meetings which he was in the habit of arranging 'under initials or in 'envelopes addressed to other persons;' but we are not aware what answer Dr. Pusey returned to these enquiries, nor do we know of the names of any of the former or present occupants of the episcopal bench who were willing to make themselves responsible for such proceedings.

It is no part of our present object to enquire whether the accusations preferred in this particular instance by Mr. Maskell were or were not substantiated by evidence. It is an undoubted fact that clandestine correspondence has been carried on by Ritualistic confessors with their penitents, and it is an equally undoubted fact that these self-constituted confessors have in many cases obtruded themselves into parishes with which they were officially unconnected, and, in defiance of the first principles of that canonical law which they profess to respect, have exercised priestly functions where they

Office for the Visitation of the Sick, in 'all *private confessions*,' which is contained in the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI., was removed in A.D. 1552, and was not restored at any of the subsequent revisions.

* Homilies, p. 480. Oxford, 1844.

† Letter to the Rev. Dr. Pusey on his practice of receiving persons in Auricular Confession, p. 21. William Pickering, 1850.

possessed no priestly jurisdiction. Again, we are aware that it is recommended, as some safeguard against those evils of which even Ritualists are not altogether unconscious, that 'confessionals should be in the more open parts of the church,' or; according to 'The Priest's Prayer Book,' that confessions should be heard in 'the church, or at least in the vestry;' but we believe that the time has not yet arrived in which the much-enduring laity are prepared for the erection of confessionals in every parish church, or in which the bishops, as ordinaries, have sanctioned their introduction; nor do we know of any means by which other safeguards, which have been or which may be suggested, can be practically enforced. The system of Ritualism, in this as in other respects, has made such rapid strides within the last twenty years that our bishops no longer think of suspending the licenses of curate confessors, as in the case of Mr. Poole, or even of issuing commissions of enquiry, as in the case of Mr. West; and the tone and temper of the nineteenth century differ so widely from those of the sixteenth that, whatever beneficial result was anticipated from such a proposal in A.D. 1562, we believe that few of our legislators would now attempt so to distinguish between 'private 'godly admonitions' and 'sacramental confession' as to propose, in the terms of one of the 'General Notes of Matters to be moved in the next Parliament and Synod,' that 'what priest or minister soever, under colour hereof, shall practise auricular confession, shall be deprived of all his livings, and deposed from the ministry.'*

It would be a mere waste of time to adduce further evidence in proof that the doctrine and practice of Ritualism on the subject of confession and absolution are diametrically opposed to the authorised formularies of the English Church, and to the teaching of her great divines; in the eyes of a plain member of the Church of England those who adhere to these practices are schismatics and dissenters.

Of this system of private confession—whether more or less fully carried out—Dr. Pusey professes to have had more than forty years' experience; and we cannot set before our readers a more striking contrast between the beneficial results of the system as alleged by its upholders, and its baneful tendencies and results as maintained by its impugnors, than we find in Dr. Pusey's preface to the Abbé Gaume's 'Manual for Confessors' on the one hand, and in the following extract from the address of the late Bishop of Winchester, to which we have

Strype's 'Annals of the Reformation,' vol. i. p. 323, fol. 1725.

already referred, on the other. In Dr. Pusey's preface to the work of the Abbé Gaume, he not only boasts of the unspeakable benefits which have resulted from the practice of confession as taught by himself and by those who adopt his views, but he is bold to assert that, after an experience of its working extending over more than forty years, 'no one pretends that any knowledge of evil has been conveyed through the practice' (p. ix.). On the other side of the question we will quote the following extract from a report of the address delivered by the late Bishop Wilberforce at Winchester House a few days before his death, which was prepared by a comparison of notes taken at the time:—

'Now of this I will say, that this system of confession is one of the worst developments of Popery. In the first place, as regards the *penitent*, it is a system of unnatural excitement, a sort of spiritual dram-drinking, fraught with evil to the whole spiritual constitution. It is nothing short of the renunciation of the great charge of a conscience which God has committed to every man—the substitution of confession to man for the opening of the heart to God—the adopting in every case of a remedy only adapted to extreme cases, which can find relief in no other way. Then in families it introduces untold mischief. It supersedes God's appointment of intimacy between husband and wife, father and children, substituting another influence for that which ought to be the nearest and closest, and producing reserve and estrangement where there ought to be perfect freedom and openness. And lastly, as regards the person to whom confession is made, it brings in a wretched system of casuistry. But far worse than this, it necessitates the terrible evil of familiar dealing with sin, specially with sins of uncleanness, *thereby sometimes even tending to their growth, by making the horrible particulars known to those who have hitherto been innocent of such fatal knowledge, and so poisoning the mind of priest and people alike. A fact which has of late been very painfully brought home to me.*'*

V. We must now briefly consider the teaching of Ritualistic literature in regard to the observance of unauthorised festivals and superstitious customs, the invocation of saints and angels, and the credit which is due to Romish legends. We may form some idea of the extent to which these innovations upon the established usage of the English Church have been carried within the last twenty years by reference to any one of the numerous unauthorised calendars with which Ritualistic literature abounds, and more especially by a comparison of the earlier with the later editions of these calendars. Thus, if

* *Anglo-Catholic Principles Vindicated*, p. 457. James Parker & Co., 1878.

we refer to the calendar and to the index of the first edition of the 'Directorium Anglicanum,' which was published in the year 1858, we find no mention made of the Feast of *Corpus Christi*. If we turn, however, to the second edition of that work, which was published in 1865, we find the following notice:—

'The Feast of Corpus Christi—kept on the Thursday after Trinity Sunday—a festival observed throughout the entire Western Church, as it was formerly in England, is being restored very generally amongst us. Being in honour of our Blessed Saviour Himself, and in remembrance of His undying love to mankind, all who duly reverence and obey Him will see the great propriety and fitness of its observance. . . . Processions should be made, and special hymns sung, e.g. the *Pange Lingua*, *Lauda Sion*, &c., and sermons delivered in honour of the presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament.' *

If we turn from the 'Directorium Anglicanum' to the 'Ritual for the Altar, according to the Use of the Church of England,' we find, as an addition to the 'Rules to know when the moveable Feasts and Holy Days begin,' the following words: 'Corpus Christi is the Thursday after Trinity Sunday;' and when we turn to its appointed place in the body of this costly and elaborate volume, we find there an *Introit* and *Collect*, an *Epistle* and *Gospel*, a *Gradual*, a *Sequence*, and a *Secret*, together with words to be said at the Communion and Post-Communion, on this 'Feast of the Most Holy Sacrament, commonly called Corpus Christi Day.' The nature of the worship for which this day is set apart is described in the following extract from Dr. Littledale's edition of John Austin's 'Devotions in the Ancient Way of Offices,' a book which, according to the statement of the editor, 'more nearly replaced the Primer of Sarum for the devout laity of the last century than any other compilation that has appeared since the compulsory disuse of that work:—

'This festival was instituted the middle of the thirteenth century, as an annual protest against infidelity on a most vital point of Christian faith, and to give all the faithful an opportunity of expressing their thankfulness for the unfailing promise of our Lord to be with His Church to the end of the world. This festival is not observed by the Eastern Church: possibly the true faith has been less assailed: *the worship is one—all re-echo, "Blessed Sacrament, we thee adore!"*'

* P. 98. In the third edition of this work, published in 1866, the large and expensive second edition having been disposed of, as we learn from the preface, 'in eight months from its publication,' the same paragraph is reproduced, the words 'supernaturally present' being inserted before the words 'in the Blessed Sacrament' (p. 125).

If further evidence be sought respecting the character of this worship as a 'protest against infidelity,' we may refer our readers to the prayers recommended for this 'sacred season and festival' in the 'English Catholic's Vade-Mecum.' The following are some of the petitions which we find in 'the Litany of the Most Holy Sacrament,' the use of which is recommended at this time:—

'Supernatural Bread, have mercy upon us.'

'Most high and adorable Sacrament, have mercy upon us.'

'True Propitiation for the quick and the dead, have mercy upon us.'

'Tremendous and life-giving Sacrament, have mercy upon us.'

(P. 72.)

It will scarcely be thought matter of surprise, when worship such as this is represented as a 'protest against infidelity,' that the remedy should, in some cases, be regarded with greater apprehension than the disease.

Amongst those days the commemoration of which, according to the second and third editions of the 'Directorium Anglicanum,' is allowed by 'tradition, custom, and the tacit sanction of ecclesiastical authorities,' we find mention made of the Feast of the *Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary*. Mr. Orby Shipley, in the 'Ritual for the Altar,' has provided a service with *Introit, Collect, Lesson, Gradual, and Gospel* for this occasion. There appears to be a slight difference between our Roman and our Anglican Ritualists respecting the event or events which they commemorate on this day, Mr. Orby Shipley assuring his readers that on this day the Virgin 'endured temporal death,' whilst Dr. Littledale's edition of John Austin's 'Devotions' makes no allusion to the day of her death, but refers to the fact of her burial previously to her assumption. Both, however, are agreed in teaching that on this day the Virgin was taken up into heaven. We quote the following words from the *Invitatory* which we find in the 'Devotions in the Ancient Way of Offices':—

'To-day the Mother of our Lord was assumed into heaven. *Alleluia!*

'And seated in glory above the highest angels. *Alleluia!*

'Her sacred body, too pure to mix again with dust. *Alleluia!*

'Soon left the grave, and was carried up to her eternal mansion. *Alleluia!*' (P. 164.)

But it appears that we have not yet reached the limits to which Ritualism is prepared to extend the *cultus* due to the Virgin Mary. It was alleged by Dr. Pusey, in his first 'Eirenicon,' that the formal reception of the doctrine of the *Immaculate Conception* would prove 'one more difficulty in the way

‘ of the reunion of Christendom ’ (p. 121), if not an insuperable obstacle in the way of corporate reunion with the Church of Rome. With reference to the ‘ Feast of the Conception of the ‘ Blessed Virgin,’ Dr. Pusey wrote as follows:—

‘ We see the growth. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has prevailed, although opposed at its first appearance by S. Bernard, with no foundation in antiquity, grounded on the fact of the celebration of the Feast of the Conception (which yet related at first to the *Sanctification* of the Blessed Virgin, the *contradictory of her Immaculate Conception*), opposed by a chain of later writers whom Rome too has canonised, and even at the last by grave bishops, on the ground of the inadequacy of the proof, or the injury which they apprehended to their flocks, or the increased difficulties to those external to the Roman communion.’ (Pp. 177, 178.)

The first words of this paragraph apply very pertinently to the gradual development of Ritualistic teaching on the *cultus* due to the Virgin Mary. In Mr. Orby Shipley’s ‘ Ritual of ‘ the Altar ’ we find a form of service introduced for the Feast of the Conception, with an *Introit, Collect, Lesson, and Gospel*; whilst in Dr. Littledale’s edition of John Austin’s ‘ Devotions ’ we find the following paragraph, in which the distinction, or rather the contradiction, which Dr. Pusey has pointed out between the *Immaculation* and the *Sanctification* of the Virgin is not only ignored, but the two terms are apparently regarded as equivalents. It is as follows:—‘ Conception of the Blessed ‘ Virgin Mary, Dec. 8. It is the mystery of the Immaculation or Sanctification of the Blessed Virgin which is the ‘ object of the Church on this festival rather than her bare ‘ Conception. . . . The doctrine of the perfect freedom from ‘ sin in the Mother of God has ever been held by the faithful ‘ as a pious opinion, though not ruled *de fide* by Œcumenical ‘ Council ’ (p. 210).

Some idea of the marvellous rapidity with which unauthorised services and superstitious usages have recently crept into the English Church may be obtained from a comparison of the *fourth* with the earlier editions of ‘ The Priest’s Prayer Book.’ In none of the first three editions of ‘ The Priest’s Prayer ‘ Book ’ do we meet with any allusion to the custom of anointing the sick with oil; and although in all the editions of the ‘ Directorium Anglicanum ’ we find directions respecting the anointing, we can discover no indication in that book of the source from which the ‘ holy oil ’ is to be derived. In the fourth edition of ‘ The Priest’s Prayer Book,’ however, which appeared in the year 1870, and in the preface to which the editors express their obligations to the *bishops* and theologians

who have examined and revised the proofs of the 'Pontifical,' as well as to other *prelates* and divines who 'in various ways' 'have given their assistance,' we find not only a form for 'the anointing of the sick,' together with a large number of other unauthorised services, but we find, in the 'Pontifical' which is, for the first time, introduced into this work, a service for the 'consecration of chrism and holy oils,' as well as a variety of other services of which the English Prayer Book knows nothing, and in the celebration of which a bishop alone is competent to officiate. We should demand strong evidence of the fact before we could bring ourselves to the belief that any English bishop has shown himself so unworthy of the office which he bears, and of the obligations under which he lies, as to take part either in the compilation of this *Pontifical*, or in the use of the various benedictions which we find in it of candles and crosses, of girdles and garlands, of veils and rings, or that any of the rulers of the Church, whose special duty it is to see that the laws of the English Church are duly observed, had exposed themselves to the penalties of the Act of Uniformity by such flagrant violations of the law as many of these services involve. We think, however, that it is imperative upon the editors of the 'Priest's Prayer Book' that they should state who are the 'prelates' to whom their obligations are due in regard to this 'Pontifical,' and, by so doing, that they should exculpate the English episcopate from any implication in a charge which, if substantiated, would be prejudicial to their character as men of integrity, and fatal to their reputation as maintainers of the doctrine and administrators of the discipline of the English Church.

We now proceed to examine the teaching of Ritualism in regard to the invocation of saints and angels. The general character of that teaching may be inferred with sufficient accuracy from the 'Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles' by the late Bishop Forbes, and from Canon Humble's essay on the subject in the third volume of 'The Church and the World.*' We quote the following passage from the former of these sources:—

'In principle, then' (the late Bishop of Brechin thus sums up his views), 'there is no question herein between us and any other portion of the Catholic Church. Even when the incommunicable attributes

* The general character of this Essay may be inferred from a single passage in which Canon Humble is pleased to express his belief that 'Invocation may not be *absolutely requisite for salvation*.' ('The Church and the World,' 3rd volume of the series, p. 141. 1868.)

of God have, in expression at least, been invaded, the real underlying belief has been explained to be that nothing is obtained for man, no grace, no aid, no gift for body, soul, or spirit, except through or from the One Mediator between God and man, our adorable Lord, Christ Jesus. . . . If the intercession of believers on earth may be invoked without injury to the honour of Christ as Mediator, why not also the intercession of the saints in heaven ? *

The general character of these invocations is so well known that it would be useless to multiply quotations. In the edition of Scupoli's 'Spiritual Combat' which forms one of the volumes of the 'Library of Spiritual Works for English Catholics' published by Messrs. Rivington, we read thus: 'To practise this devotion with ease and order, you may divide the different ranks of the blessed into seven parts, 'according to the seven days of the week.' The order of devotions follows, from which we extract the following passage :—

'On Sunday honour the nine choirs of the Angels; on Monday, St. John the Baptist; on Tuesday, the Patriarchs and Prophets; on Wednesday, the Apostles; on Thursday, the Martyrs; on Friday, Bishops and other Saints; and on Saturday, the Virgins and other holy women. But omit not on any day the Blessed Virgin, Queen of all Saints, your guardian Angel, St. Michael the Archangel, and all your patrons.' (Pp. 126, 127.)

It would be easy to multiply similar quotations, did our space permit, but we refrain. The following extract, however, from Mr. Orby Shipley's 'Invocation of Saints and Angels,' is so characteristic of the school to which the editor belonged at the time of its publication that we are tempted to reproduce it for the benefit of our readers. Having first laid down the proposition that the invocation of saints and angels is 'a privilege, not a duty,' Mr. Shipley proceeds thus :—

'And the words of the Doctors of the Council of Trent, whilst they may be accepted as the completest answer to those who consider Article XXII. to prohibit our use of invocation, may be also taken as the fullest definition of the practice which Catholic dogma requires. The Decrees of Trent declare "that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke (the Saints), and to have recourse to their prayers, aid, and help, for obtaining benefits from God, through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, "who is our only Redeemer and Saviour." And this position, as has been shown in the Essay by an Anglican Priest, if not explicitly taught by the Fathers of the Pan-Anglican Synod, appears to have been im-

* 'Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles,' 2nd ed., 1871. James Parker & Co. Pp. 422, 423.

PLICITLY accepted by the Bishops of the Anglican Church, who assembled at Lambeth and held out the right hand of fellowship to that Orthodox Church of the East whose veneration of the Saints is even more authoritatively decided than that of the Latin Church in the West.' (P. xxxii.)

We would direct the special attention of our readers to the passages which we have printed in italics, as affording a fair specimen of Ritualistic theology and of Ritualistic ingenuity. We are too familiar with the prevailing characteristics of Ritualistic literature to experience much astonishment even at its boldest and most startling propositions. We think, however, that some even amongst the most ardent admirers of that literature will scarcely be prepared to follow Mr. Shipley in his reference to the 'Decrees of the Council of Trent' as a key to the true import of the twenty-second 'Article of Religion' of the English Church, or in his appeal to Archbishops Tait and Thompson as explicit or implicit patrons of the worship of saints and angels on the ground of their participation in the proceedings of the 'Pan-Anglican Synod at Lambeth.'

VI. Our survey of Ritualistic literature would be incomplete if we were to take no notice of the hymnology by means of which the distinctive tenets of Ritualism are widely, and in many cases imperceptibly, diffused. If there be any truth in the saying that the ballads of a people produce a more sensible effect upon their national character than the laws under which they live, it will follow, as a matter of course, that the hymns, which now form an important element in the public worship of most congregations, must, sooner or later, exercise an important influence upon the creed of the worshippers. The Ritualists have displayed their customary sagacity in taking advantage of this organ for the dissemination of their distinctive doctrines and practices. The volume entitled 'Hymns Ancient and Modern,' one of the most popular hymnals of the present day,* and, as regards the greater portion of its contents, deservedly so, contains some hymns which—whatever the original design of their composers—are calculated to instil into the minds of unwary worshippers doctrines which are diametrically opposed to the formularies of the English Church. The following lines will suffice to illustrate our meaning:—

* We are informed that twenty million copies of these hymns have been put into circulation; and it is said that this volume has recently been recognised by the Chaplain-General as the only hymnal which is henceforth to be in use in the army.

‘Word-made-Flesh true bread He maketh
 By His Word His flesh to be,
 Wine His Blood, which whoso taketh
 Must from carnal thoughts be free.’

And again:—

‘Therefore we, before Him bending,
 This great Sacrament revere.’

It is obvious that when taken in conjunction with the teaching on the Eucharist to which we have already referred, and with the ritual observances which are now commonly practised in the celebration of ‘the Mass,’ these words will be commonly regarded by the worshippers in Ritualistic churches as inculcating the real objective presence of Christ’s body and blood in the consecrated elements, and the adoration which is alleged to be due to Christ ‘under the forms of bread and wine.’

It would be easy to adduce from the popular manuals of devotion, to which reference has been made in this article, hymns of a yet more objectionable character than those from which the above lines are quoted. One example must suffice by way of illustration. It is the adaptation of one of our popular hymns to the worship—as we think it is impossible that the words can be otherwise interpreted—of the sacramental elements of the Eucharist. The following are the first and last verses of this adapted hymn, as we find it reproduced in ‘The English Catholic’s Vade-Mecum:’—

‘Jesus, my Lord, my God, my All!
 How can I love Thee as I ought?
 And how revere this wondrous gift,
 So far surpassing hope or thought?
Sweet Sacrament, we Thee adore!
 Oh make us love Thee more and more!

‘*Thy Body, Soul, and Godhead all!*
 O mystery of love divine!
 I cannot compass all I have;
 For all Thou hast and art are mine!
Sweet Sacrament, we Thee adore!
 Oh make us love Thee more and more!’

Such language may indeed find its justification amongst those who contend that the doctrine of the Church of Rome and that of the Church of England on the subject of the Eucharist are identical. To all others we submit that it can appear in no other light than as plainly and unequivocally *idolatrous*.

It will be superfluous, we think, to adduce further evidence that Ritualism can be regarded in no other light than as a deliberate scheme for the revival of mediæval Christianity

in its most debased and most corrupted form; that it lacks the tests of catholicity on which its advocates profess to rely; and that it derives no other sanction from the formularies of the English Church than a few isolated passages which are capable of being interpreted in a sense which the revisers of the English Prayer Book repudiated, and which is opposed to the teaching of the great divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The system of Ritualism is based upon a view of the visible Church essentially opposed to that of the twentieth Article of Religion, and one which naturally leads either to secession to the Church of Rome, or to efforts in order to effect a corporate reunion with her. In total oblivion of the fundamental design of Jewish ritual, as expounded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, our modern Ritualists seek to 'build again' in the Christian Church those 'rudiments of the world' and those carnal ordinances which it was the object of Christ's Gospel to destroy. Unmindful of the fact that, under the Mosaic dispensation, a gorgeous and imposing ceremonial was maintained only in one place, and that, as regards the nation at large, the worship of the Jews was strikingly devoid of outward rites and observances, the Ritualists proceed on the assumption that a minute ritual has been uniformly sanctioned, if not enforced, alike under the Jewish and the Christian dispensation. Nay, more; so completely has the true typical import of the Jewish ritual been overlooked, that Ritualism, in defiance of sound exegesis and in direct antagonism to historical evidence, not only represents the worship of the heavenly temple as 'the normal form of the worship of the Christian Church,' but teaches its disciples that the 'wondrous language' of St. John was 'adapted to the ceremonial of the liturgy then followed by the Christians in celebrating the Eucharistic Sacrifice.'*

Nor can it be alleged that the living voice of the Church, so far as it has been expressed by her duly appointed rulers, carries any greater weight with Ritualists than the teaching of the Apostolic Epistles, the voice of primitive antiquity, or the direct statements of the Articles and Formularies to which they still profess their adherence. When the Oxford Tracts first made their appearance, the voice of the bishop was represented in them as the voice of God, and when Mr. (now

* *Directorium Anglicanum*, p. 16. In the course of his examination before the Ritual Commission, Mr. Nugee professed that an obligation rested upon him to conform in matter of ritual to 'the Church of the Apocalypse.'

Cardinal) Newman transferred his allegiance from the Church of England to that of Rome, he could find no fitter words in which to signify his submission to the Chair of St. Peter than in the resolution which he expressed to yield the same submission to the Pope which he had heretofore yielded to his own bishop. It is notorious that no such sentiments are entertained by the Ritualists of the present day. The general tone which is adopted in their leading organs towards the most distinguished members of the Episcopal Bench is that of contempt, and not unfrequently of abuse. The funds of the English Church Union are avowedly raised and expended in enabling clergymen to resist the so-called 'unreasonable and 'illegal demands' of their bishops; and a society has been set on foot by certain persons who profess themselves members of the English Church as established by law, the avowed object of which is to sever the connexion between the Church and the State. The time has long gone by when any but the most superficial observers of the growth and development of Ritualism can regard the conflict which is now being waged as a conflict between the forces which have been commonly designated as High and Low Church principles. There may be, indeed, and we doubt not that there are, some misguided individuals amongst those who espouse the cause of Ritualism, who are sincerely attached to the English Church, and who believe that the best interests of that Church are promoted by the zeal and devotion of its Ritualistic members. The real question, however, is not the piety or the liberality of individuals, nor the object towards which their efforts are consciously directed. The question at issue is, What is the real tendency of Ritualism as a system, and what would be the result of its general adoption by the clergy and laity of the English Church? And to these enquiries there can be returned but one answer on the part of those who are acquainted with the doctrines and the practices which Ritualism inculcates. Its object is to un-Protestantise the English Church, and the result—should that object be attained—would be to reduce a Church which has hitherto been the great bulwark against Rome into a state of absolute subjection to her sway, and to impose upon her members a yoke more grievous to be borne than that from which she was delivered by the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It rests mainly with the laity of the English Church to decide whether the great conflict which is now being waged shall issue in victory or in defeat.*

* It is curious that, at the time when an Anglican sect is making

ART. II.—*The Life of Benjamin Franklin, written by Himself.* Now first edited from original Manuscripts, and from his printed Correspondence, and other Writings, by JOHN BIGELOW. London: 1879.

IF the several causes of the foundation of the Republic of the United States were ranged according to their respective importance, first of all would come the perverse policy of Mr. George Grenville, and the want of moral courage in Lord North to resist the unenlightened obstinacy of George the Third. If not demerits but merits were classified, an equal rank, and that the highest, must be assigned to George Washington and Benjamin Franklin. So far as any historical events can be appropriated to individuals, those two men were the joint authors of the great Republic. The common English impression of Franklin recognises only two stages in his career. From the struggling printer he is transformed at a bound into the powerful diplomatist who tore asunder Great Britain and her American colonies. The actual Franklin rose gradually to this enormous influence. He had already become independent in fortune before he engaged in public affairs. When he had once taken to public life, he made it his profession, though he sighed after science. Step by step he grew to be the most prominent citizen of Philadelphia. He was appointed Clerk of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania; he became a justice of the peace, an alderman, a Burgess of the Assembly. He established the first public library in America. He founded an academy and a hospital. He set on foot a militia force for the defence of the province against the French in Canada. 'There was,' he writes in his Memoirs, 'no such thing as carrying a public-spirited project through without my being concerned in it.' If it were so small a matter as clearing away the dust from the roadways or lighting the city, he had to take the initiative. One question was always asked when subscriptions for an improvement were requested: 'Have you consulted Franklin, and what does he think of it?' From

these evident advances to Rome, a distinguished Roman Catholic layman, the Marquis of Bute, should, for the first time, have published the Roman Breviary in the vulgar tongue of Englishmen, and even adopted the language of our own Church in his version of the Collects and the Psalms, and some hymns of our own writers. This is a very interesting publication.

Pennsylvania his influence spread throughout the American colonies. He was appointed Postmaster-General for America. That office he kept for over twenty years. His enemies in England often hoped to taunt him into surrendering it. But he lacked, he was in the habit of saying, 'the Christian virtue of resignation.' It was his rule 'never to ask for offices,' but also 'never to resign them.' Franklin had passed his seventieth year before he arrived at the Court of France as the champion of American independence. A long and active life had preceded his greatest achievement, the conclusion of the Peace of 1783.

In view of an impending war with France in 1754, he drew up a plan for 'the union of all the colonies under one government, 'so far as might be necessary for defence, and other important 'general purposes.' The scheme roused jealousy in England, and Franklin attributes to that feeling the despatch of General Braddock from England with two regiments of regulars for the expedition against Fort Duquesne. Though the project of the campaign was not Franklin's, it was only by his help that the army was able to move a step. Horses and carriages could not be procured until Franklin had personally guaranteed payment to the lenders. He accompanied the force, and in vain endeavoured to dissuade the General from marching in a slender line nearly four miles long through a country infested by hostile Indians. The General's answer was: 'The savages 'may indeed be a formidable enemy to your raw American 'militia; but upon the King's regular and disciplined troops, 'sir, it is impossible they should make any impression.' In the panic which followed Braddock's failure, Franklin carried a Bill in the Pennsylvania Assembly for the embodiment of a militia force. To concentrate more attention on the movement, he persuaded the Governor to proclaim a fast, that 'the 'blessing of Heaven might be implored on our undertaking.' He even obtained subscriptions from Quakers for gunpowder under the euphuism of 'bread, flour, wheat, and other grain.' He himself raised and commanded a regiment. Governor Dunbar offered to commission him as general of a force which he was to raise and lead against Fort Duquesne. Franklin had the modesty to decline the service which had proved fatal to Braddock. But he might reasonably have esteemed himself not much inferior in soldierly competence to incapables. such as the British Government thought good enough for colonial commands. Of Braddock's successor, Lord Loudoun, he writes: 'I wondered much how such a man came to be 'entrusted with so important a business as the conduct of a

'great army; but having since seen more of the great world, and the means of obtaining and motives for giving places, my wonder is diminished.'

In the years between 1743, when he began to have leisure for public affairs, and 1757, when he came to England as Agent for his province, he was learning the lesson he applied eighteen years later. He was learning to despise the Home Government's method of managing colonial affairs, and to value aright the internal strength of the colonies for their own defence. He arrived in London on July 27, 1757, no obscure stranger, but the most prominent citizen of the most important foreign possession of the Empire. The object of his journey had nothing in it of hostility to the Crown. The real sovereign of Pennsylvania was not the House of Hanover, but the family of William Penn. The heirs of Penn appointed the governor of the province, and their governor's one care was to see that none of the public burdens touched the vast estates of the Proprietary. Their nominee, the governor, refused his assent to any tax from which his principals were not expressly exempted. At every step for the protection of the province by the maintenance of an efficient militia, the Assembly found itself checked in its measures for raising the necessary revenue by a veto from the Governor. Franklin was the most energetic enemy of the Proprietary. His future implacability against the American 'Loyalists' originated probably in his early resentment against the Penns, who were among the foremost of them. So far the province felt itself drawn to the Crown through their common interest in defensive measures against hostile Indians and Frenchmen. Indeed, at the Privy Council, Lord Mansfield used his authority to break down the Proprietary's obstinacy. Yet even so early as this, Franklin's indignation was stirred by the exorbitant claims of the Crown to authority over the colonies. Within a few mornings after his arrival in London the brilliant and eccentric Lord Granville, better known as Carteret, who was President of the Council, granted him an interview. Lord Granville then surprised him by the statement that 'the King's instructions to his governors, being first drawn up by judges, then considered in council, after which they are signed by the King, are, so far as they relate to you Americans, the law of the land, for the King is the legislator of the colonies.' 'His lordship's conversation,' wrote Franklin, 'a little alarmed me as to what might be the sentiments of the Court concerning us.' For the moment Franklin's aim was to extort liberty from the ungenerous domination of a private family. He registered,

however, the pretensions of the royal prerogative as matter of future warning.

On his second visit to England he bore originally a commission only from the Pennsylvanian Assembly. To the Agency for Pennsylvania were gradually added the Agencies for Georgia, Massachusetts, and New Jersey, as the colonies found that what had been only a theory of the royal prerogative was in process of conversion into practice. He had come once more in 1763 to intercede against the King Log of the Proprietary Constitution. He found himself to be confronted with much more formidable claims of the British nation and Parliament. He still is seen, as in old days, appealing to the Sovereign; only formerly it was against the Penns he besought his aid, now it is against the King's own ministers. The Stamp Act was passed by Parliament on the pretext of reimbursing this country for the cost it had defrayed in expelling the French from Canada and Nova Scotia. Franklin, by conversation, by private letters, and in the public press, was always forward to deny that the colonies owed any debt to the mother-country. The mother-country had engaged in war with France for its own ambitious purposes. The war was not a colonial, but an Imperial war. The colonies had, he would have admitted, benefited by the results of the war. He was always forward to express his delight at the subjugation of the French territories. But he rejoiced 'not merely as a colonist, but as a 'Briton.' A moral duty lay on the colonists, their Agent confessed, to pay their share of the expenses because they were Britons. The fact, however, he asserted, was that they had already paid their share, and more than their share. 'Every 'year during the war requisitions were made by the Crown on 'the colonies for raising money and men. They made more 'extraordinary efforts in proportion to their abilities than 'Britain did.' What was the proportion to their abilities, he urged, was matter for grave consideration. He complained that it was a favourite device, 'in order to render the taxing 'of America a popular measure, to insist continually on the 'topics of our wealth and flourishing circumstances, while this 'country is loaded with debt, great part of it incurred on our 'account.' The truth was, according to him, that, magnificent as he accounted American prospects, the present was discouraging. Colonies, he forcibly argued, are not, like their countrymen at home, heirs to many generations of laborious ancestors. They have to do all for themselves; their expenses press so closely on the heels of their resources that a great part of the charges for the rout of Braddock and the triumphs of

Wolfe and Amherst 'lies still, in 1766, a load of debt upon them.'

Even had Great Britain made them its debtors by relieving them from the perpetual terror of French attack at its own sole cost, the discharge of the moral debt should have been matter of mutual arrangement. But the colonies were being taxed by a Legislature in which they were not represented. When their aid in money had formerly been required, the custom had been to ask it of their Assemblies, as the Crown asked it of Parliament. On all proper occasions they were ready to grant aid as Parliament granted it. 'We of the colonies 'have never insisted that we ought to be exempt from contributing to the common expenses necessary to support the 'prosperity of the empire.' They did insist that the money of the King's subjects in America could no more be taken from them without their own consent, obtained through their representatives, than from the King's subjects in England. 'If the 'Parliament has a right thus to take from us a penny in the 'pound, where is the line drawn that bounds that right, and 'what shall hinder their calling, whenever they please, for the 'other nineteen shillings and eleven pence?' Franklin's theory of the relation of the colonies to Great Britain was that they were 'only connected, as England and Scotland were 'before the Union, by having one common sovereign, the King.' The founders of the colonies expressly went to the New World to escape from the tyranny of English statutes. 'They took 'with them, however, by compact, their allegiance to the King, 'and a legislative power for the making a new body of laws 'with his assent, by which they were to be governed. Hence 'they became distinct States, under the same prince, united as 'Ireland is to the Crown, but not to the realm, of England, and 'governed each by its own laws, though with the same sovereign, and having each the right of granting its own money 'to that sovereign.'

The weak point in Franklin's theory of colonial rule is that it implies the King could come to the consideration of colonial questions as if for the time he were transported bodily, and unattended by any of his Parliamentary advisers, across the Atlantic. Franklin would have been as unwilling to have Lord Hillsborough dictating to the colonies under cover of the King's name as to have the Parliament doing it. Probably he would not have been disposed to deny the difficulty of emancipating the King whenever he had to exercise his colonial prerogative from an English sovereign's habit of deference to the ministers delegated by Parliament. But when

Englishmen dwelt upon the 'inconvenience' of a theory which supposed the division of 'an empire into many separate states,' he answered that 'an inconvenience proves nothing but itself.' It was, however, his consciousness of the difficulty of fastening upon the King double functions which doubtless suggested to him, as to his friend Lord Kames, a consolidating union of Great Britain and the American colonies as the way out of the dilemma. If the colonies sent members to Parliament, Parliament in taxing them would not have been disjoining taxation from representation. The King, in exercising his colonial prerogative at the instance of his Parliamentary advisers, would have been exercising it with the implied assent of his colonial subjects. Franklin's logical objection to the actual mode in which the King and the British Parliament assumed to rule the colonies was that colonists were treated as possessed of inferior liberties to their fellow-subjects here. They were governed without having a voice in their government. The grant of proportionate representation in the Imperial Parliament to Pennsylvania and the rest would have brought their subjection to the supremacy of Parliament at all events into logical conformity with the theory of the British Constitution.

That any such Parliamentary union with the North American colonies would have been permanent it is impossible to believe. Franklin affected to think 'it would probably subsist so long as 'Britain shall continue a nation.' On the contrary, the first occasion on which the colonial representatives had been overborne by the English and Scotch members would have dissolved it. Franklin himself would have been the first to denounce a connexion in which British representative heads were counted as against colonial. Great Britain and the American colonies were doomed to part by the very incompatibility of their rival greatness. The projects Franklin and some of his English and Scotch allies devised with a view to averting the catastrophe carried on their face proof of their want of reality. It was, however, a gratuitous addition to the shock of predestined separation that British politics should at the time have been passing through a stage of moral degradation which intensified the violence of the wrench. Almost more grievous still was the coincidence that it was the fate of England to have Franklin, of all men, for witness of the ruin.

In the earlier years of the reign of George III. the whole body of British politics was sick, it seemed, to death. The few statesmen who were incorrupt were technical fanatics, like Mr. George Grenville, or 'inaccessibles,' like Lord Chatham.

They were commonly of a worse type. There was the careless King's minister, like Lord North, who for the sake of peace with his colleagues, 'some of whom could not be brought to agree to the repeal of the whole Stamp Act,' suffered his better sense to be overridden, and consented to maintain 'the duty on tea, with the obnoxious preamble, to continue the dispute.' There was the man of pleasure, like Lord Clare, who, 'after we had drunk a bottle and a half of claret each, hugged and kissed me, protesting he never in his life met with a man he was so much in love with.' There was the official, incapable of understanding that a colony could have rights, like Lord Hillsborough, 'whose character is conceit, wrong-headedness, obstinacy, and passion.' There was the minister with an instinct of equity, but without the moral courage to adhere to it, like Lord Dartmouth, 'with dispositions for the best measures, and easily prevailed with to join in the worst.' There was the mob of peers, not vouchsafing even to consider, still less to understand, Lord Chatham's plan for pacification: 'Hereditary legislators! There would be more propriety, because less hazard of mischief, in having, as in some university of Germany, hereditary professors of mathematics.' There was a House of Commons, costing 'no less than four thousand pounds for a member.' There was the abandonment of London for days to 'a drunken mad mob,' which had made a hero of 'an outlaw and an exile of bad personal character.' 'I went last week to Winchester, and observed that for fifteen miles out of town there was scarce a door or window shutter next the road unmarked with "Wilkes and Liberty," and "No. 45." ' There was, at least in the American's eyes, 'in short, a whole venal nation, now at market, to be sold for about two millions, and able to be bought out of the hands of the present bidders, if he would offer half a million more, by the devil himself.' This was a population which talked of 'our colonies,' as if Pennsylvania and Massachusetts and Virginia were private possessions of every ignorant Englishman. To Englishmen, an American's only apology for existence was to buy English goods. These people, who thought themselves competent to legislate for America, could scarcely point out its place on the globe. They would not of themselves have seen any incongruity in Franklin's jest that the King of Spain had contracted for the casting of a thousand guns at Quebec, or detected the absurdity of his assurance that 'the grand leap of the whale in the chase up the Falls of Niagara is esteemed, by all who have seen it, as one of the finest spectacles in nature.' For a time the King

was the refuge of Americans enraged and outraged by the pretensions of men they despised to lord it over their superiors in character and public spirit. Franklin records with delight so late as 1772 how 'the King has been heard to speak of 'me with great regard.' He loved to contrast the goodness of the King with the stupid selfishness of the nation. But gradually he begins to 'suspect, between you and me, that the 'late measures have been very much the King's own, and that 'he has in some cases a great share of what his friends call 'firmness.' He hopes still that, 'by some painstaking and 'proper management, the wrong impressions the King has 'received may be removed.' But at length the suspicion becomes certainty, the hope fades, and he is forced to the conclusion, which was unhappily only too true, that 'the King 'hates us most cordially' in the aggregate, and 'that insidious 'man,' Franklin, in particular.

King George thought all who disagreed with him madmen or rogues. We know from the Shelburne Correspondence how he consoled himself at the end of the American war with the reflection that 'knavery seems to be so much the striking feature 'of the inhabitants, that it may not in the end be an evil that 'they will become aliens to this kingdom.' At all events, his instinct of aversion from Franklin did not deceive him. Whatever was vicious and out of joint in the relations between England and its colonies showed uglier and more misshapen as reflected through Franklin's eyes. It was not by any design or desire of Franklin that his mission in England irritated every disposition in the two peoples to quarrel. His correspondence shows that, though he could not avoid perceiving the blunders of English dealing with America, he would have been far from disinclined to aid in correcting them. He had shown himself so temperate a mediator between the two countries, that when the Stamp Act was promulgated in America in 1766 his house and family in Philadelphia were threatened by a mob. His complaint in 1768 had probably not been insincere that, as he had rendered himself suspected in England of being 'too 'much an American,' in America, on the contrary, he was suspected of being 'too much an Englishman.' He argued that 'between the governed and governing every mistake in 'government, every encroachment on right, is not worth a 'rebellion.' To the very eve of the civil war he was ready to discuss ways by which it might have been avoided. Yet an agent of the colonies much less acute, much less of an impassioned enthusiast for peace, with a far inferior title to gain an audience of ministers and orators, would have had

more chance of success in appeasing the feud. As we read the correspondence which Mr. Bigelow has compiled and condensed, we feel the issue of the controversy to be a foregone conclusion. Franklin taught his countrymen to despise the mother-country. He seemed always to be presenting an ultimatum. In 1766 he writes of the Stamp Act: 'As to executing the Act by force, it is madness, and will be ruin to the whole.' In 1771 he writes to the Massachusetts Committee of Correspondence about the exaction of customs in America by Parliament, that civil war is the certain result. 'The bloody struggle will end in absolute slavery to America, or ruin to Britain by the loss of her colonies; the latter most probable from America's growing strength and magnitude.' Another representative of the colonies would probably have begun by assuming the indissolubility of the bond which united Great Britain and its American settlements. Franklin showed himself to his countrymen perpetually in the act of testing the chain, to judge where were the weak links at which it might be expected to break. Instead of a mediator come to negotiate a removal of colonial grievances, he appeared in the character of a judge pronouncing a divorce of the Colonies from Great Britain for British infidelity and general desertion of duties.

Jobbing English politicians felt and resented the tone of scornful superiority in Franklin's remonstrances on behalf of his constituents. They exulted in the opportunity afforded them for a retort by his appearance before the Privy Council to give evidence on the petition of Massachusetts for the removal of Governor Hutchinson and Lieutenant-Governor Andrew Oliver. The ground of the petition was that correspondence which had fallen into Franklin's hands between them and a Mr. Whately, who had been private secretary to Mr. George Grenville—not, as Mr. Bigelow styles him, 'Lord' Grenville—convicted them of having incited the British Government to the measures which had produced the strife between it and the colonies. The scene in the Council Chamber on the historical 29th of January, 1774, was an explosion of wrath long pent up. The whole, as Franklin wrote to Mr. Cushing, was 'in all probability preconcerted.' The thirty-five Privy Councilors, forgetting that they were sitting as judges, 'frequently laughed outright,' as Dr. Priestley narrates, 'at the sallies of Mr. Wedderburn's sarcastic wit.' They were charmed to retaliate thus on the Transatlantic moralist who, they well knew, had been for seventeen years registering their follies and corruptions. They were not altogether wrong in condemning

the conduct of Franklin in that transaction. It is not necessary to accept Wedderburn's insinuation that Franklin had employed his opportunities as American Postmaster-General to intercept Governor Hutchinson's letters home. Mr. C. Francis Adams's account is probably true, that the papers were delivered to Franklin by Sir John Temple. But not the less had both Franklin and the Assembly of Massachusetts violated, in the use they made of them, the confidence of private correspondence. Franklin's defence has been commonly accepted by Americans. It was that private letters written by a highly placed official on public questions to a member of the British Parliament could not be described as private letters. That was the conclusion also of the Massachusetts House of Representatives. The fallacy of such a position is apparent. It is at least as extraordinary that Franklin should have thought the misuse of Governor Hutchinson's correspondence balanced by the publication and despatch to the English Government of the letters sent by Franklin as the Agent of the Massachusetts Assembly to the Assembly. Obviously publicity, though within a limited circle, was contemplated by the writer himself as a property of the letters to the Assembly, and privacy as a property of those of Governor Hutchinson to Mr. Whately. Most extraordinary of all was Franklin's profession of amazement in the account he published of the whole transaction that the British Government should not have profited by the occasion and left Governor Hutchinson and his brother officials 'like the scapegoats of old to carry away into the wilderness all the offences which have arisen between the two countries.' He could not understand, any more than after the war when Great Britain interceded for the restoration of the Loyalists who had suffered in its cause, that a Government cannot with any self-respect shift the consequences of its blunders on subordinates who have served it. He actually appears to have anticipated gratitude from British Ministers for the part he had played in the miserable business. 'A Court clamour,' he exclaims in his narrative, 'was raised against me as an incendiary! The very action upon which I valued myself as, it appeared to me, a means of lessening our differences, I was unlucky enough to find charged upon me as a wicked attempt to increase them. Strange perversion!'

The 29th of January, 1774, shattered what Franklin was fond of calling that 'China vase,' that 'beautiful porcelain vase,' the British Empire, as then constituted. From that day, though Franklin himself was possibly unconscious of the

catastrophe, no hope lingered of reconciling the claims of Great Britain to sovereignty, and of the colonies to equality. On the day following the baiting at the Council Office, he was informed that 'his Majesty's Postmaster-General had found 'it necessary to dismiss him from the office of Deputy Postmaster-General in North America. Yet he lingered for 'another year and four months, observing a cool, sullen silence 'to Ministers.' He kept, he writes, 'a separate account of 'private injuries, which,' he adds, 'I may forgive.' He certainly never did forgive them. But, though henceforth he did not court, neither did he reject overtures for an arrangement of the difficulty between two kindred peoples. Mr. Bigelow's volumes are full of interminable negotiations between Franklin on one side, and Lord Howe, Lord Hyde, Dr. Fothergill, Mr. David Hartley, and Mr. Barclay, on the other, for a basis of settlement. Franklin visited Lord Chatham at Hayes, to consult on possible means of accommodation. The great man's equipage was seen at Franklin's door in Craven Street, 'on the very day twelve months,' as Franklin proudly notes, 'that the Ministry had taken so much pains 'to disgrace me before the Privy Council.' Franklin by no means repulsed the assistance thus proffered for the reunion of the two countries. He remarked, with pleasure, the sympathy of Dissenters and Irishmen, and other victims of English legislative exclusiveness, with the resistance of the colonies, and their belief that 'the salvation of English liberty depended 'now on the perseverance and virtue of America.' The negotiations went on as merrily as if none of the parties to them entertained any suspicion that the subject-matter of their conferences had ceased to exist, that the British Plantations in North America had expanded into a nation. Even at this distance of time, an English student is sensible of a sort of despair, from the consciousness how only the surface was stirred by these elaborate discussions. The deliberations commonly accompanied or followed a game of chess between Franklin and Lord Howe's sister. They had neither less nor more of seriousness about them than the tournament of the chessboard. On points of detail Franklin was ready enough to give way. He offered to pledge his personal security for the repayment to the merchants of their losses on the tea thrown into Boston harbour. But when it came to the question of conceding legislative independence to the colonies, neither could he abate a jot, nor the English volunteer pacificators concede the demand. The utmost to which Franklin's English friends felt they could even offer to pledge the British nation was, that the bare right

of Parliament to supremacy should be so guarded in its exercise as to be practically dormant. Chatham himself could not presume to ask of the nation at large anything higher. When, moderate as was Chatham's plan for a settlement, and enormous as was his personal authority, the Peers would not so much consider it as to allow it to lie on their table, it may easily be conceived how utterly insoluble had the crisis become.

Yet of the two sides there was on the English more, we would almost say, of good faith than on the American. We are far from imputing conscious insincerity to Franklin. He foresaw war as the necessary consequence of a failure to repair the breach; and his common declaration may be believed, that he was almost inclined to think 'there was never a good war, nor a bad peace.' He was no fanatical admirer of particular forms of government. But circumstances, he obviously felt, had rent England and its American colonies asunder, and there was no possibility of healing the wound. His Quaker, Dissenter, and Chathamite friends could scarcely believe in such a schism in the imperial unity. Even at the moment of recognising the independence of the United States, seven years later, statesmen looked forward to a possible return of the colonies to their allegiance. No Englishman could comprehend, as Franklin could, the capacity of the colonies for standing alone. In exhorting, when the British ministers had shown themselves unbending in 1775, the Americans to resist, for that 'nothing could secure the privileges of America but 'a firm, sober adherence to the terms of the association made 'at the Congress,' men like Barclay and Fothergill hardly suspected that the firmness meant final separation. In asserting that 'the salvation of English liberty depended on the 'perseverance and virtue of America,' they were thinking of Americans as fellow-subjects, whose voices in favour of liberty would be added to their English voices in right of their common country. We can see better in these days, and so could Franklin in his. The condition of things may be summed up in a sentence. A United American Congress was sitting at Philadelphia, and Benjamin Franklin had been scolded and sneered at by the Solicitor-General of England and the King's Councillors as a thief. It would have been wonderful surgery to reincorporate the bleeding limb in the old body. It would have needed nothing less than a miracle when the fragment torn from the mutilated British trunk was itself grown into a breathing being.

Franklin shook the dust of England from his feet, as a subject of King George, when he set sail for America in 1775.

When he returned to Europe it was to watch and to baffle from Passy the clumsy efforts of British Ministers to make a solitude where they had failed to maintain peace. He was so far a diplomatist that he had studied human character for seventy years. Yet in England his diplomacy had only exasperated. In France he accomplished as much against England, as Washington with all his victories. His knowledge of French was so indifferent, that on one occasion during the sitting of the Academy he was observed to 'applaud the 'loudest at his own praises.' He did the work, but he never learned the dialect, of diplomacy. He was that strange creature, a Republican at the Court of a pure monarchy. In Paris his defects were virtues. His scientific fame spoke for itself in purest Parisian French. As a politician, to the Court he was the dire enemy of England; to the jaded society of Paris he was the representative of a new world of feeling and thought. His New England astuteness seemed to Parisian courtiers patriarchal innocence. His naïve stories and illustrations, which a thousand admirers were ready to translate and repeat in every circle of the town, were as bracing as quinine. His very costume, 'his hair hanging, his spectacles on his nose, 'his white hose, and white hat under his arm,' in the midst of absurd perukes and brocaded suits, came like a revelation of nature to the victims of fashion. He became, to his own amusement, the idol of Paris. 'Mr. Franklin,' writes a contemporary Parisian, 'is besieged, followed, admired, adored, wherever he 'shows himself, with a fury, a fanaticism, capable no doubt of 'flattering him and doing him honour, but which at the same 'time proves that we shall never be reasonable.' He tells his daughter that incredible numbers had been sold of clay medallions of him, 'some to be set in the lids of snuff-boxes, and 'some so small as to be worn in rings.' 'Pictures, busts, and 'prints have made your father's face as well known as that of 'the moon.' A great Parisian lady wrote fifty years later to the respectable Ticknor in language which implied that she thought the Americans and the Patagonians kindred peoples. After the same fashion, Versailles was never perhaps quite certain that the New England philosopher was not of Red Indian descent. But love does not reason. Paris had fallen in love with Franklin, and in homage to him even grew enamoured of simplicity.

No Englishman was ever so caressed in Paris, for the very reason that Franklin was, and was not, an Englishman. As the American sage and philosopher, he performed as much for his country as he accomplished by his diplomatic skill.

But he was a diplomatist too, and of high rank in the art. Colleagues and rivals, like his detractor Arthur Lee, or even Jay and Adams, who, as Mr. Fitzherbert wrote, in a letter quoted by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice in his *Life of Lord Shelburne*, 'rather fear than are attached to him,' might be pardoned for inability to understand the source of his influence. They did not venture to deny the fact. In the only serious instance in which, in reference to the disputed fishery and boundary rights, he was accused of neglecting the interests of his countrymen, his colleagues certified that he had defended those interests with his counsels and his authority. On another and more important point, he not merely co-operated but took the initiative. A man who had gone through the campaign with Braddock, who had shared in the apprehensions and labours of the crisis which followed the British defeat, and exulted in the triumph of Wolfe, was not likely to depreciate the value of Canada. The question of the moral right of the colonies to the old French possessions in North America had been a special point in the futile negotiations between himself and Lord Howe in England. When the war commenced, he sought to induce France to help the colonies to wrest Canada and Nova Scotia from England. As soon as the negotiations for peace with England opened, his great efforts were directed to persuade the English Commissioner, Richard Oswald, to see the utility of ceding those territories as proofs of a desire for that 'sweet' thing, a 'reconciliation,' and as a safeguard against future causes of strife. Oswald, a prosperous Scotch merchant, was, as Franklin says of him, an old man who had 'nothing at heart but the good of mankind, and putting 'a stop to mischief.' But he does not seem to have been fit to cope with a consummate philanthropist like Franklin. He had happened to let fall an opinion, that 'the giving up of 'Canada to the English at the last peace had been a politic 'act in France, for that it had weakened the ties between 'England and her colonies, and that he himself had predicted 'from it the late revolution.' Franklin, who had been preparing the ground by asserting the title of the United States to reparation over and above the mere grant of peace, for the injuries England had inflicted, proposed that Canada should be given and accepted as such reparation. He applied Oswald's own argument to the future: 'I spoke of the occasions of quarrel that might be produced by England continuing to hold Canada, hinting at the same time, but not 'expressing too plainly, that such a situation, to us so dangerous, would necessarily oblige us to cultivate and strengthen

'our union with France.' Oswald 'appeared much struck with my discourse.' Franklin had already developed a scheme on paper which he lent Oswald to read and meditate upon. The plan was, that 'Britain should voluntarily offer to give up the province, though on these conditions, that she shall in all times coming have and enjoy the right of free trade thither, unencumbered with any duties whatsoever; that so much of the vacant lands shall be sold as will raise a sum sufficient to pay for the houses burnt by the British troops and their Indians, and also to indemnify the Royalists for the confiscation of their estates.' Oswald, he says, 'told me that nothing in his judgment could be clearer, more satisfactory, and convincing, than the reasons in that paper; that he would do his utmost to impress Lord Shelburne with them.' Franklin, in reporting by letter this conversation to his brother Peace Commissioner, Adams, describes Oswald's remarks rather more fully than in the semi-official journal he kept. He tells Adams on April 20, 1782, his proposal about Canada: 'Mr. Oswald liked much the idea, but said they were too much straitened for money to make any pecuniary reparation; but he should endeavour to persuade their doing in this way.' Oswald went to England to confer with Lord Shelburne, taking Franklin's paper with him. On his return to Paris, he informed Franklin that 'it seemed to have made an impression, and he had reason to believe that it might be settled to our satisfaction towards the end of the treaty; but in his own mind he wished it might not be mentioned at the beginning; that his lordship indeed said he had not imagined reparation would be expected, and he wondered I should not know whether it was intended to demand it.' A day or two after, Franklin conversed again on the subject with Oswald. 'Oswald repeated to me his opinion, that the affair of Canada would be settled to our satisfaction, and his wish that it might not be mentioned till towards the end of the treaty.' But it has now been proved by the publication of the French despatches, which are to be found in M. de Circourt's translation of Bancroft's history, that no one was more bitterly opposed than the French ministers to the annexation of Canada to the United States. Eager as they were to promote the separation of the British provinces in America from the mother country, M. de Vergennes was entirely opposed to any extension of the emancipated territory; and he perhaps still cherished a hope that the French provinces in America, which had been conquered by England only twenty years

before, might one day be brought back to their allegiance to the Court of Versailles.

Franklin, as a diplomatist, was not peremptory in insisting on the rights of his country, still less on his own dignity. But he studied the French men and the French women who ruled France, and he probed to the bottom the instincts of the French governing class, without losing his own. About alliances in general he was not solicitous. Before he started on his own mission to Europe he had in Congress, though in vain, deprecated the sending a 'virgin' republic 'suitoring' for the friendship of European Powers. 'It seems to me,' he writes, 'that we have in most instances hurt our credit and 'importance by sending all over Europe, begging alliances, and 'soliciting declarations of our independence. The nations, perhaps, from thence seemed to think that our independence is 'something they have to sell, and that we do not offer enough 'for it.' Writing to Jay, at Madrid, in April 1782, he exclaims: 'Spain has taken four years to consider whether she should treat 'with us or not. Give her forty, and let us in the meantime 'mind our own business.' Five years before, in 1777, he and his fellow-representatives of the United States in Europe had received instructions that, 'in case France and Spain will 'enter into the war, the United States will assist the former 'in the conquest of the British sugar islands, and the latter in 'the conquest of Portugal, America desiring only for her 'share what Britain holds on the continent.' Americans must blush to think that their new-born commonwealth should have sought aid in its emancipation by offers to assist in enslaving another free state which had never done it an injury. We are glad, for the credit of Franklin, to observe that he simply recites these instructions in a letter to Arthur Lee, who was in Burgos. He adds not a word implying approbation of the offer of such a bribe to Spain.

But, in fact, he cared little for other European alliances than the American alliance with France. To cement that he was ready to be all complaisance. His tact alone prevented a rupture with the French Ministers through the signature, in December 1782, behind their backs, of the preliminary treaty between Great Britain and the United States. His brother Commissioners, Jay and Adams, suspected that the French Government wished to protract the negotiations for its own objects, however the United States might suffer by the prolongation of the war. Their suspicion was not without foundation; and Franklin, when he understood the facts, acquiesced in their decision to proceed independently. But he had the

wisdom, which his colleagues lacked, to be content with starting peace on its route without breaking down the bridge by which it had crossed before he knew whether it might not be useful for a retreat. To the French Minister's reproaches for the departure from good fellowship, he replied by the soft answer which turneth away wrath. He defends himself, and Jay and Adams, against the charge of anything worse than 'indiscretion,' and 'neglect of a point of *bienséance*.' To those two offences he pleads guilty. But he warns M. de Vergennes not to forget the effect of a quarrel upon 'the English, 'who, I just now learn, flatter themselves they have already 'divided us.' The friendly relations of France and the United States had seemed in danger of being completely overclouded when Franklin's amiable apologies restored peace. Two days after the French Ministerial remonstrance, the United States actually received from the French treasury a new loan of six million francs, which infused new life into their military operations. Jay and Adams, 'who,' alleges M. de Vergennes, 'do 'not pretend to recognise the rules of courtesy in regard to 'us,' could never have obtained that aid. Franklin's brother Commissioners underrated the gain to the United States from French succour. Without the diversion France created in Europe, and the subsidies she granted, it is almost incredible that the Congress should not have been compelled to make a humiliating peace with King George. Franklin understood that the French alliance was vital to his people, and he spared no pains that he might confirm it. As Jefferson said of him, in extolling his diplomatic dexterity, he, by his reasonableness, moderation, and temper, so won the confidence of the French ministers that 'it may truly be said they were more under his 'influence than he under theirs.'

Englishmen were not so criminal, nor was England so near to the close of its greatness, as Franklin supposed. On the other hand, neither was the power of France so deeply rooted as it appeared to his friendly eyes, nor French aid to the struggling Republic so generous as he habituated himself to represent it. While he was keen to detect the perversion of free institutions to the purposes of selfish corruption in England, he chose to be for the most part utterly blind to the more radical vices of French government and society. He remarks, almost as if it were matter of praise, that 'the 'noblesse always govern here,' and that 'trade is not their 'admiration.' On his journey, in 1785, through France to Havre, where he was to embark for America, he was entertained at the magnificent château of the Archbishop of Rouen,

Cardinal Rochefoucauld. He seems not to have felt the Revolution in the air, and goes out of his way to testify that 'the Cardinal is much respected and beloved by the people of this country.' In England the foundations were sound. Much practical liberty, and even good administration, were compatible with electoral dishonesty and political perversity. But Franklin could perceive no hope of a remedy for the inconsistencies between theory and practice which disgusted him. Not altogether in jest does he advise Englishmen to 'dissolve your present old crazy constitution, and send members to Congress.' The entire order of things in France was rotten at the core, yet Franklin was more than half inclined to live and die there. When the tempest had actually begun to rage, he still regarded it as a mere passing gust. He writes in October, 1788, to his friend M. le Veillard: 'When this fermentation is over, and the troubling parts subsided, the wine will be fine and good, and cheer the hearts of those who drink of it.' Had his life lasted a little longer, he would have had to lament the death, on the scaffold, of the correspondent to whom he wrote thus hopefully, and of a multitude of other friends.

Franklin simply did not see the instability of that charming Parisian society to which he discoursed in his shrewdly witty parables. We suspect that he only affected not to perceive the selfish motives at the bottom of the invaluable assistance the French nation and Government afforded his country. Chivalrous Frenchmen like Lafayette, in advocating the American cause, were more protesting against Court absolutism at home than against the Imperial tyranny of Great Britain. Frenchmen generally and their rulers, when they succoured the United States, were merely fighting, as they had fought a generation earlier, England in America. They longed to recover Canada. When they had convinced themselves that their American allies would not consent to their return as sovereigns to any part of the North American continent, they liked better to leave their old dominions in the hands of England than struggle for their transfer to the emancipated British colonies. Whilst Great Britain remained still a neighbour they believed the Republic would not be able to dispense with the shelter of French protection. Franklin, who gauged human motives, especially when not altogether noble, with unerring sagacity, was possibly more desirous to convince Robert Livingston than himself convinced, when he wrote: 'The ideas of aggrandisement by conquest are out of fashion. The wise here think France great enough; and its ambition at present seems to be only that of justice and magnanimity towards

'other nations, fidelity and utility to its allies.' With this amiable construction which Franklin puts on the motives of French kindness to the American colonies of England in 1783, it is interesting to contrast his view of French official civilities sixteen years before. In 1767, after his examination by the House of Commons on the subject of the Stamp Act, the French Minister Plenipotentiary in London, M. Durand, called upon him.

'M. Durand,' writes Franklin to his son, 'is extremely curious to inform himself on the affairs of America; pretends to have a great esteem for me; invited me to dine with him, was very inquisitive, makes me visits. I fancy that intriguing nation would like very much to meddle on occasion, and blow up the coals between Britain and her colonies; but I hope we shall give them no opportunity.'

The certainty that, had the American connexion with Great Britain survived the Stamp and Tea Duty Acts, it must have collapsed in wider ruin a little later, produces a feeling of indifference to the personal incidents which contributed to the actual catastrophe. Otherwise, English readers of these volumes might be disposed to repine that Franklin should not have bestowed on the task of reconciling England and the colonies some of the unfailing *bonhomie* which kept the peace between the United States and France. As, when the war was once begun, every feature in the French national and political character was interpreted by him too kindly, so all in the English were interpreted too harshly. He made no account of the difficulties inherent in the relations of the colonies and the mother-country. To him there could be no fault on the former side, because there was nothing but what was faulty on the latter. He hears with delight of the vengeance of which the 'No Popery' mob was the unconscious instrument upon Lord Mansfield and Governor Hutchinson. 'Lord Mansfield's house is burnt. Thus he who approved the burning of American houses has had fire brought home to him. He himself was horribly scared, and Governor Hutchinson, it is said, died outright of the fright' He speculates with pleasure on the possible wreck of the whole British Empire: 'If the English lose their Indian commerce and one battle at sea, their credit is gone, and their power follows.' He foretells that the war 'must end in the ruin of Britain, if she does not speedily put an end to it.' He believes every tale of the 'cruel captivity' to which 'our brave countrymen,' 'martyrs to the cause of liberty,' are subjected, 'fed scantily on bad provisions, without warm lodging, clothes, or fire.' He denounces the war 'on the part of England as, of all the

' wars in my time, the wickedest, having no cause but malice ' against liberty, and the jealousy of commerce.' He despairs of seeing its end because, he writes to an Englishman, ' your ' thirsty nation has not drunk enough of our blood.' Every Englishman is held by him guilty of complicity. But he attached especial guilt to all public men. He had written while fresh from England, in 1775, to his old friend, William Strahan, the King's printer : ' Mr. Strahan, you are a Member ' of Parliament, and one of that majority which has doomed ' my country to destruction. You have begun to burn our ' homes and murder our people. Look at your hands; they ' are stained with the blood of your relations. You and I ' were long friends; you are now my enemy, and I am yours.' Guilty above other Members of Parliament were, in his eyes, the King's Ministers. ' I never think,' he writes to Mr. James Hutton, in 1778, ' of your present Ministers and their ' abettors but with the image strongly painted in my view of ' their hands, red, wet, and dripping with the blood of my ' countrymen, friends, and relations.' Upon King George himself, once his admired mediator between a tyrant Parliament and oppressed colonies, he pours out all the vials of his wrath. He charges upon the King the destruction, ' in a ' continued course of bloody wars, of near one hundred thousand ' human creatures.' To Franklin the King must account for two thousand scalps torn from defenceless farmers, their wives, and children, by the savages he hired. To Franklin the royal wickednesses are the best evidence of immortality. ' The more I see the impossibility, from the number and extent of his ' crimes, of giving equivalent punishment in this life, the more ' I am convinced of a future state in which all that here appears to be wrong shall be set right.'

The disposition in Franklin to misjudge England impresses readers of his correspondence the more that he was by theory and practice generally indulgent to principles and conduct, however differing from his own. So ostentatiously violent are his outbursts of anger at the English king, ministers, and nation, and, with this exception, so universally philanthropic and moderate are Franklin's general sentiments and language, that it is sometimes hard to smother a suspicion that the harshness against his former fellow-subjects and sovereign was a species of affectation. A more probable hypothesis would be that it was nature's revenge for the regular and continued repression to which from early manhood he had subjected his natural disposition. From the training the Autobiography shows him to have undergone, we can infer something of his

original temper. In that unique work, now for the first time, through Mr. Bigelow's care, printed as Franklin wrote it, and with the last few pages which had never before been published, Franklin alludes to his native impetuosity, and to the means he took to correct it. When young, he was, he says, of a 'disputatious turn,' a very bad habit, he remarks, into which 'persons of good sense seldom fall, except lawyers, university men, and men of all sorts that have been bred at Edinburgh.' Noticing that 'disputing, contradicting, and confuting people are generally unfortunate in their affairs,' he exchanged the habit, after reading Xenophon's 'Memorabilia,' for the Socratic method. 'I dropt my abrupt contradiction and argumentation, and put on the humble inquirer and doubter.' He became so expert a master of dialectics, that a controversial printer with whom he worked at Philadelphia would at last 'hardly answer me the most common question without asking first, "What do you intend to infer from that?"' As that very irritating substitute for dogmatism proved not more likely to make friends than his former practice, he retained of the Socratic method 'only the habit of expressing himself in terms of modest diffidence.' 'I never use,' he writes, 'when I advance anything that may possibly be disputed, the words "certainly," "undoubtedly," or any others that give the air of positiveness to an opinion, but rather say, "I conceive or apprehend a thing to be so and so," or "It is so if I am not mistaken."' When he set up his 'club of mutual improvement,' the Junto, the rules drawn up by him were framed on the same principle. 'Everything was studied which might prevent our disgusting each other.' 'To prevent warmth, all expressions of positiveness in opinions, or direct contradiction, were after some time made contraband, and prohibited under small pecuniary penalties.' The restraint of the Junto may be answerable in part for the freedom with which, when patriotism seemed to license him, the unlucky Lord Hillsborough is characterised as a compound of 'conceit, wrongheadedness, obstinacy, and passion,' and even 'insincerity.' If King George, once 'the very best king in the world, and the most amiable,' is condemned to Tophet for not letting the American colonies go free on their own demand, the warmth of the denunciation may have only been compensation for the studied temperateness which overlay a nature apparently by no means devoid of passion and excitability. Franklin had brought himself to regard varieties of doctrine and opinion as not worth the friction of loss of temper, with the one exception of the question of national liberty and indepen-

dence. That appeared to him on a different level altogether. On that he esteemed anger lawful and virtuous, and, we suspect, he found an occasional indulgence in it by no means disagreeable.

Franklin could at once bear vituperation with the stoicism of a tortured Indian, and then turn and wither up an assailant with lightning flash and fire. But the extraordinary feature both in his tolerance and in his intolerance is that no one ever supposes his indignation was not as much within his own command as his patience. We have hitherto dwelt chiefly on the value of Mr. Bigelow's edition of the *Autobiography and Correspondence* as recalling a great political and historical epoch. It possesses as much value of a different sort, as making for the first time popularly accessible the most marvellous instance of a formed and built-up character in the whole of the records of psychology. There was the raw, original Franklin, who might have developed in this or that direction, and there was a very different creature, the actual Franklin, as Philadelphia and London and Paris knew him. The rough material had been hewn and carved and polished into the finished moralist, statesman, diplomatist, fabulist, and general worker in human wit, by a third self, a moral censor who was continually surveying and criticising the new fabric as it grew.

Franklin was at an early period dogmatic; as we have seen, he discovered that was an inconvenient character with which to make the pilgrimage of life; he corrected it at first by enquiring into the foundations of the dogmas of others, instead of propounding dogmas himself. People liked no better to be obliged to render an account of their own beliefs than to have another person's belief forced upon them; his inner monitor accommodated matters by engrafting a habit of suggesting an opinion; whoever chose were left at liberty to suppose they had elaborated it out of their own heads. There was good free blood in the veins of the Franklins. His father, Josiah, had quitted Ecton, in Northamptonshire, for Boston in 1682, for the sake of liberty of worship. He had a library of 'books of dispute 'about religion,' and Franklin when a mere boy read them out of a mere natural 'bookishness.' Later, when he was about fifteen, 'some books against Deism fell into my hands; they 'were said to be the substance of sermons preached at Boyle's 'Lectures. It happened that they wrought an effect upon me 'quite contrary to what was intended by them; for the arguments of the Deists, which were quoted to be refuted, appeared 'to me much stronger than the refutations; in short, I became 'a thorough Deist.' There worked the natural Franklin. But

he argued from his new point of view to such effect as to convert his friends, and several of them ended by defrauding him. Consequently his monitor 'began to suspect that the 'doctrine, though it might be true, was not very useful.' Deism was put out at the door, and 'trust, sincerity, and integrity,' together with an apparently very sincere faith in Providence, were introduced instead. He accepted even Revelation, to such an extent, at any rate, as to assume that, 'though certain actions might not be bad because they were 'forbidden by it, or good because it commanded them, yet 'probably those actions might be forbidden because they were 'bad for us, or commanded because they were beneficial to us.' A man's belief is commonly part of himself, the growth of his own nature. Franklin ceased to be a rationalist because his inner monitor had examined the reasons for and against, and arrived at the conclusion that it was for his general advantage and comfort and respectability and internal satisfaction to be unenthusiastically religious.

His own devotions he performed at home, but he had so high an opinion of the utility of public prayer that he persuaded the Federal Convention to commence its sittings with prayer. Of the advantages of a regular liturgy he was equally convinced. To popularise the Prayer Book he helped the reformed Lord Le Despenser, once the friend of Wilkes and 'Abbot' of Medmenham, whom Mr. Bigelow occasionally denominates Lord Spencer, in abridging it. For his share he took the Catechism and the Psalms. This edifying work was published by a bookseller in St. Paul's Churchyard in 1773. Franklin's heart, however, was at all times more susceptible of charitable than of theological emotions. Writing in 1758 to his sister of an acrostic on her name, in which faith was described as occupying the Christian's ground floor, hope the first floor, and charity the garret, he bids her 'Get as fast as you can into 'the garret, for in truth the best room in the house is charity. 'For my part, I wish the house was turned upside down; it is 'so difficult (when one is fat) to go upstairs.' Religion moved him, not dogmatic theology. Everyone knows his remark: 'Orthodoxy is my doxy, and heterodoxy is your doxy.' He could not understand why some American gentlemen who desired to officiate according to the rites of the Church of England in the United States, and whom the Archbishop of Canterbury refused to ordain unless they took the oath of allegiance, should not ordain one another. As they objected, he asked the Papal Nuncio in Paris to direct a Roman Catholic bishop in America to ordain them. He was surprised that the

Nuncio insisted they should turn Catholics first. Mr. Whitefield, he mentions in the Autobiography, 'used sometimes to pray for my conversion, but never had the satisfaction of believing that his prayers were answered.'

Followers of Whitefield could specify the day and even the minute of their conversion. Franklin had his conversion and its epoch too. But, as with his religious views and practices, so his morality was done to order. The natural Franklin was ordered by his ruling self 'to acquire the habitude of all the virtues.' In the year 1728, being then twenty-two, 'I conceived the bold and arduous project of arriving at moral perfection. I wished to live without committing any fault at any time. As I knew, or thought I knew, what was right and wrong, I did not see why I might not always do the one and avoid the other.' He accordingly divided all the virtues into thirteen, temperance, silence, order, resolution, frugality, industry, sincerity, justice, moderation, cleanliness, tranquillity, chastity, and humility. Humility was not in his first draft. He introduced it, 'a Quaker friend having kindly informed me that I was generally thought proud, being in conversation overbearing and rather insolent, of which he convinced me by mentioning several instances.' He kept a kind of diary, with a page allotted to each of the thirteen, and 'determined to give a week's strict attention to each of the virtues successively.'

Order he found the hardest of all the virtues to acquire. 'In truth, I found myself incorrigible with respect to order; and now I am grown old, and my memory bad, I feel very sensibly the want of it.' Humility was another difficult virtue. But, writes Franklin, 'though I cannot boast of much success in acquiring the reality of this virtue, I had a good deal with regard to the appearance of it. 'On the whole,' he adds, 'though I never arrived at the perfection I had been so ambitious of obtaining, but fell far short of it, yet I was, by the endeavour, a better and a happier man than I otherwise should have been if I had not attempted it.' Mr. Bigelow found a marginal note appended to the original MS., from which his edition of the Autobiography is printed: 'Nothing so likely to make a man's fortune as virtue.' The natural Franklin was guilty, as his own censorious self often remarked, of various 'errata' in youth. In his Autobiography and in his letters to friends he avows a wish to have his life come over again, that he might enjoy 'the advantages authors have in a second edition to correct some faults of the first.' But that, we should suppose, was only a tribute to the virtue of humility.

His conscience seems to have cleared itself of all uncomfortable twinges for his youthful misdeeds. Of misdeeds in after life, except in the matter of an occasional second bottle of *Madeira* and a preference for riding to walking, he shows no consciousness. Even the glass too much and the bodily indolence brought their own sufficient penalty in visitations of gout, which balanced the account.

Franklin's description of himself, both in the *Autobiography* and in his correspondence, resembles a little too much the portrait of a self-sufficient, self-made, pompous tradesman. Vice is represented as want of practical wisdom, not as something to arouse shame or moral indignation. Such a disposition would have broken up an empire and plunged the world in war, in revenge for London not agreeing with a Philadelphian alderman's estimate of his own merits. On the contrary, the universal testimony of America, and France, and of a large body of the most upright and honest Englishmen, pronounced Franklin the brightest and least egotistical of companions, the warmest of friends, the most devoted and disinterested of patriots. George the Third's condemnation of his 'insidiousness' bore testimony to the apparent frankness and simplicity which the King believed to conceal continual intrigues. The King was similarly prejudiced against the French envoy, Rayneval, for having 'the appearance of an inoffensive man of business,' since 'cunning will be more dangerous under so specious a 'garb.' Franklin was simply one of that class of men to whom the capacity has been given of surveying themselves from the outside as well as from the inside. He desired to judge himself as a stranger would have judged him. Some men do that towards the close of their lives, when their careers are become to them mere matter of history. He did it not in his *Autobiography* alone, but in every incident of his busy life. The quality in one sense is not very rare. But commonly they who are their own critics lose in courage and decision what they gain by appraising themselves at their proper value. They escape the danger of overrating their real merits, and they succumb to the danger of frightening themselves with their own shadows. Self-consciousness and timidity dwarf and repress all vigour of growth. The happy peculiarity of Franklin's nature was that it remained buoyant and independent in spite of the sense that at the end of each day it was sure to be called up to render an account of itself. His original self took advice from his educated self, yet never ceased to be spontaneous. He studied humanity as mirrored in his own nature. There he traced the varying strength of

motives, and the mode in which they operate. What he saw he was ready enough to expose to the view of other men. The world at large was fascinated and charmed by being admitted to the contemplation of the most masculine and capacious of minds, through which its owner himself appeared always ready to act as guide.

The strength and variety of his friendships are among the most conspicuous features of his career. We know the fact by his correspondence; and also why it should have been so. As a lad he won predominating influence over more brilliant acquaintances, like Ralph and Osborn, the 'eminent lawyer' with whom Franklin 'made a serious agreement, which Osborn 'never fulfilled,' that 'the one who happened first to die should, 'if possible, pay a friendly visit to the other, and acquaint 'him how he found things in that separate state.' Keith the Governor of Pennsylvania, Burnet the Governor of New York, conversed with him, while a journeyman printer, as almost an equal. Whitefield would not resign the hope of converting so illustrious a moralist. Lord Kames, a forgotten celebrity, whose fame once ranked with that of Hume and Gibbon, was his intimate, with whom at various times he 'passed weeks of densest happiness.' Though politics, and perhaps the contrast between his measured equability of manner and Johnson's strongly accented temperament, kept them apart, Boswell was proud to be his acquaintance and his host. Cowper treasured the praises of his poems by 'one of the first 'philosophers, one of the most eminent literary characters that 'the present age can boast of.' Chatham sought his friendship. Fox eagerly claimed him 'still for a countryman. Lafayette haunted him, much to the disgust of the English Peace Commissioners, who thought they could understand Franklin, but not the French knight-errant. Mirabeau was the bearer of letters of introduction from him to America, and encircled his memory when dead with the halo of his brilliant eloquence. His successor at Paris, Jefferson, agreed that 'no one could 'replace Dr. Franklin,' for the reason that no one could excite so much interest as a man. Washington was proud to be counted among his friends. He was honoured by all the kings he ever had an opportunity of meeting, except his own. He was loved by the old lodging-house keeper in Craven Street where he lived. None could have been better company. He could play chess, and the next moment be weaving a new web of politics. He could fathom the secrets of nature, and explain them as if he were telling a fairy tale. He could make a real fairy tale the vehicle for a moral lesson, and hide

a political sarcasm in a mock proclamation by the great Frederick. If the company loved its wine, he could drink as stoutly as Dr. Johnson. He had no fear of the gout before his eyes when fair ladies filled the glass, and wits were hanging upon his lips.

He enjoyed a large share of happiness in life, and was grateful for it. He himself has written: 'The felicity of my life, when I reflected on it, has induced me sometimes to say that, were it offered to my choice, I should have no objection to a repetition of the same life from its beginning.' At the age of twenty-one, he nearly died of pleurisy. 'I was,' he says, 'rather disappointed when I found myself recovering, regretting in some degree that I must now, some time or other, have all that disagreeable work to do over again.' As life proceeded he found quite enough of what was agreeable in it to make up for the vexation of its having a close. At the age of sixty-three, he could say appreciatively: 'Take one thing with another, and the world is a pretty good sort of world.' He was content to go on enduring its vicissitudes: 'Though living on in one's children is a good thing, I cannot but fancy it might be better to continue living ourselves at the same time.' In one way old age itself, which otherwise he would not object to have cured in himself along with other diseases, had its advantages. 'As I grow old I grow less concerned about censure.' As he grew old, he did not grow less willing to continue that exertion of the energies which to him meant happiness. At the age of seventy he accepted the dangerous and delicate mission to France. 'I am,' he told the Congress, 'but a fag-end; you may have me for what you please.' At the age of seventy-nine he still found enjoyment in the management of affairs. Two years later, at the age of eighty-one, in the Convention which met in 1787 to frame the definitive Constitution, he, though opposed personally to the system of two legislative Houses, made the project practically possible by his device that all the States should be represented equally in the Upper House, and according to population in the Lower House. If he sighed over his toils at seventy-nine, it was a sigh of satisfaction at the prospect of being 'harnessed in the country's service for another year' as President of Pennsylvania. My countrymen, he wrote with manifest pleasure to a friend, 'engrossed the prime of my life. They have eaten my flesh, and seem resolved now to pick my bones.' At the age of eighty-three he still composed poetry, not very good, but not worse perhaps than what he was in the habit of writing sixty years before. Attacked

simultaneously by gout, the stone, and old age, he comforted himself that 'only three incurable diseases had fallen to his share, and that these had not deprived him at the age of eighty-one of his natural cheerfulness, his delight in books, and enjoyment of social conversation.' If obliged by his three enemies to anticipate death, he solaced himself by thoughts of a term of higher activity, and therefore enjoyment, in another stage of existence. He began to doubt whether the building, his body, did not need so many repairs that in a little time the owner would 'find it cheaper to pull it down and build a new one.' He avowed 'a growing curiosity to be acquainted with some other world,' and longed, 'free from bodily embarrassments, to roam through some of the systems Herschel has explored, conducted by some old companions already acquainted with them.' His only hesitation at the age of eighty-two is whether it were not a pity to quit this particular universe at a time of extraordinary 'improvements in philosophy, morals, politics, and even the conveniences of common living, and the invention and acquisition of new and useful utensils and instruments.' He whispers a wish that the final advance had been made in the particular art of physic, that 'we might be able to avoid diseases and live as long as the patriarchs in Genesis; to which I suppose we should have little objection.' It was almost as well that, though in 1788 he had heard rumours of John Fitch's 'boat moved by a steam engine rowing itself against tide in our river,' and though he appeared to think 'the construction might be so simplified and improved as to become generally useful,' he could not foresee the full application of the principle. It would have been too grievous to leave life on the very eve of such a revolution.

The secret of his happiness was his power of doing whatever was his work for the moment with all his might. He could enjoy the pleasures of life as heartily as he performed its toils. Both were pleasures, although only one kind bore the name. Every faculty of his nature was permitted, and even commanded, to seek in its turn occasions for its exercise. His bodily senses were encouraged to gratify themselves as well as the mental. For a sage Franklin seems to have liked good eating and drinking, perhaps even a very little too much. As a boy he was trained to be 'quite indifferent what kind of food was set before me, and so unobservant of it that to this day if I am asked, I can scarce tell a few hours after dinner what I dined upon.' He took a little later on to a vegetable diet, and used the money he saved to buy books. All the world

knows how at Watts's printing-house, in Queen Street, Franklin drank water-gruel to his companions' beer, and beat them all on the diet. As he became prosperous he acquired a decorous taste for less hermit-like fare. He confesses 'for one that if I could find in any Italian travels a receipt for making 'Parmesan cheese, it would give me more satisfaction than a 'transcript of any inscription from any old stone structure.' Parmesan had still some savour of Arcadia. But in another letter from Craven Street he remarks: 'Just come home 'from a venison feast, where I have drunk more than a 'philosopher ought.' Already at the age, for him very juvenile, of sixty-two, he was becoming stout. He observes: 'Men of my bulk often fail suddenly.' Paris was not likely to teach him plain living; fêtes, accompanied by innumerable glasses of champagne in his honour, must have been so many challenges to gout. At seventy-eight he writes to Strahan a letter of 'chit-chat between ourselves over the second bottle.' The very next letter in these volumes, addressed to Henry Laurens, begins significantly: 'I write this in great pain from 'the gout in both feet.'

His talk of indulgences in Madeira perhaps savours a little of humorous exaggeration. Certainly, in most points he would have contented Plato himself by his 'temperance' and 'justice' in respecting the independence both of his neighbours and of the various constituents of his own nature. It was this admirable orderliness of his organisation which leaves on those who only read what he wrote an impression of coldness and absence of generous fervour which his contemporaries did not feel. Franklin, as we have shown in discussing his relations with English politics, could be impassioned and even fiery. There are signs in abundance that his heart could be touched as readily and more genially by sympathy with private griefs and joys. If his acquaintances included a cross-grained aunt and a young niece, he could appreciate the tediousness of the companionship for the girl, yet compassionate even more the infirmities of body and temper of the poor old woman. 'Invent,' he writes in such a case to a young friend, 'amusements for her; be pleased when 'she accepts of them, and patient when she perhaps peevishly 'rejects them.' He lifts up his powerful voice in an appeal for mercy to the 'numbers of little innocents who suffer and 'perish' from its being unfashionable in London, and yet more in Paris, for mothers to nurse their children. In the midst of the turmoil over the Stamp Act, he is anxious in London for news of his little grandson in Pennsylvania: 'You have so

'used me,' he writes to his wife, 'to have something pretty about the boy, that I am a little disappointed in finding nothing more of him. Pray give in your next, as usual, a little more of his history.' We are afraid his admirers must admit that he too easily resigned himself to accept his wife's dread of the sea as a sufficient excuse for their remaining apart during many years. But he thought she was happy with her walnut trees and grandson; and he soothes the pangs of separation compelled by 'duty to my country,' by choosing London novelties for her, 'a crimson satin cloak, the newest fashion,' and a gown of flowered tissue, sixteen yards, 'cost nine guineas; I think it a great beauty.' While the Stamp Act was still in force he would not violate the colonial self-denying ordinance by sending Mrs. Franklin presents of British goods. The moment it was repealed, in 1766, he despatches 'a fine piece of Pompadour satin, fourteen yards, cost eleven shillings a yard.' For his wife's comfort, so long as she remained at Philadelphia, he is ready even to sacrifice the completeness of his electrical apparatus. 'If the ringing of the bells connected with the iron rod frightens you, tie a piece of wire from one bell to the other.' We are, however, bound to say that he adds: 'Though I think it best the bells should be at liberty to ring, that you may know when they are electrified; and when you are afraid, you may keep at a distance.'

His purse was always open to a tale of distress. He had an ingenious method of circulating alms, by charging it on the honour of the recipient to pass on the gift to another deserving object, if he should have the means of making payment. He sends five louis d'or to an English clergyman, taken by a French privateer, or perhaps by Paul Jones, and in prison in Paris. 'Some time or other,' Franklin tells him, 'you may have an opportunity of assisting with an equal sum a stranger who has equal need of it. If so, by that means you will discharge any obligation you may suppose yourself under to me. Enjoin him to do the same. Let kind offices go round.' To an American in distress he gives ten louis, bidding him follow the same course: 'I hope it may thus go through many hands before it meets with a knave that will stop its progress. This is a trick of mine for doing a deal of good with a little money.' He adopted the same system with the salary he received, on quitting his French mission, as President of Pennsylvania. He held that 'in a democratical State there ought to be no offices of profit.' An envoy might receive a salary, he appeared to think; and an

American Postmaster-General might for seventeen years receive the salary in London, and perform its duties by deputy in America. But he drew the line at Presidents of Assemblies and States, and the like. Accordingly, he bequeathed his Presidential salary and its accumulations on trust, among other things, for loans to young artisans. These loans, unlike Franklin's *louis d'or*, were to be repaid with interest; but the principle was the same. A limited sum was to circulate indefinitely in charity from hand to hand. The scheme failed, partly from the want of proper objects, and partly from the failure of the legacy to realise the amount it should, by Franklin's estimate of the profits of compound interest, have produced. By the end of two hundred years, two thousand pounds, he computed, should yield eight millions one hundred and twenty-two thousand pounds sterling. As in the eighty-two years from 1790 to 1872 the two thousand have produced only a little over ten thousand, that magnificent arithmetical vision would seem to have had some flaw in it. However, the intention was equally benevolent, though the trust in compound interest proved as much a broken reed in Franklin's benevolent hands as in the exceedingly selfish ones of Mr. Thellusson.

His pen was as ready as his purse in the service of all human kindness. And what a pen it was! It could discourse metaphysics so clearly and lucidly as to make them seem plain moralising. It could tear a sophism to pieces by a mere query. It could make a simple tale read like a subtle argument. He could be grave and he could be gay in a breath. He could spend as much wit and humour on a 'Craven Street Gazette'—which was meant only to amuse an old landlady away from home, and probably fearful that the world, or the Strand, would be out of joint before her return from Rochester—as on a State paper designed to fire America and sting England. In another tone he translates into human language, for the amusement of a Court lady, the reflections, in the garden of her house, of a grey-headed ephemera, full seven hours old, on the vanity of all things. His 'Petition of the Left Hand' might have been composed by Addison. In it the left hand bewails the partiality which educates the right hand exclusively. Some of Franklin's fables and tales have been so absorbed into the thought of the world that their source is absolutely forgotten. Only in this way can we account for what was doubtless an unconscious plagiarism by an eminent sanitary authority last year of Franklin's 'Economical Project for Diminishing the Cost of Light.' The economy con-

sisted simply in rising at six o'clock instead of nine or ten. A wakeful Parisian is represented as having discovered to his great astonishment that the sun actually began to shine at that hour. He calculated the saving to Paris in candle-light, should the city take advantage of the fact, at ninety-six million francs. But the philosophers of the town denied the fact itself. They proved by common notoriety that there could have been no light abroad at six o'clock, and therefore none could have entered from without. Their explanation was that the 'windows, being accidentally left open, instead of letting in the light, had only served to let out the darkness.' No one who listened last autumn to a reproduction of this bright little satire appears to have suspected its originality. That is a tribute to its modern air. But, in truth, ideas such as Franklin's never become superannuated. Again, not everyone who uses the expression, 'to pay dear for one's whistle,' knows that the dear whistle was a purchase made by Franklin, when seven years old, with a pocketful of pence. Franklin's store was too abundant for him to mind, though some of his fame went astray. 'You know,' he tells his daughter, 'everything makes me recollect some story.' But it was not recollection so much as fancy. His fancy clothed every idea in circumstances. When the illustration had served its turn, he was indifferent what became of it. If he cared at all, it was that, when borrowed by a newspaper or magazine, it should have its proper allowance of long-tailed s's and italics, and capitals to the substantives. With his old printer's prejudices, he could not understand the modern 'fondness for an even and uniform appearance of characters in the line.' He was less delighted at the complimentary censure of Lord Mansfield upon his witty and bitter 'Edict of the King of Prussia' when reprinted in the 'Chronicle,' than indignant that the 'Chronicle' should have 'stripped it of all the capitals and italics that intimate the allusions and mark the emphasis of written discourses, to bring them as near as possible to those spoken.' He thought such appeals to the eye help to raise a writer to the level of a speaker, who has at his command both accent and gesture to point his periods. Franklin did injustice to himself when he fancied he wanted any such mechanical aids. His English had been learnt from the 'Pilgrim's Progress' and the 'Spectator.' It had the force of Bunyan without his ruggedness. It had the serene light of Addison, with tenfold his raciness and vigour. It sparkled with sarcasms as cutting as Voltaire's, but all sweetened with humanity.

If a David Hume might condemn here and there a sprinkling of such words as 'pejorate,' it was not from poverty but from exuberance of diction that Franklin had exposed his vocabulary to criticism. Many of his inventions or adaptations—such as 'colonise'—have been stamped long since as current English. But he did not covet the fame of an inventor, whether in language, in morals, or in politics. In language he was even a declared foe to innovation. Writing to Noah Webster, in 1789, he protests against the new verbs, 'notice,' 'advocate,' and 'progress.' He had as little ambition to be a classic as to be an innovator in English. He wrote because he had something at the moment to say, with a view to procuring that something should at the moment be done. In religion he confessed to a certain liking for heretics, all of whom, so far as he had acquaintance with the class, he declared were virtuous men. What, however, he liked was not their heresy so much as the spirit of self-sacrifice which made them brave persecution. As a moralist he did not aspire to change the materials with which he had to deal. He was satisfied that men should make something more of their life, as their life was, without expecting to transform them into angels. When he proposed to himself moral perfection, he was conscious that he was aiming at nothing superhuman. He pared his definitions of the virtues he had resolved to practise down to the moderate level to which he felt himself not unequal. If a defect did not appear to be of a nature necessarily to injure a man's self or his neighbours, he was not prepared to banish it as a vice. Humility was one of his virtues. But humility in his sense is not incompatible with a certain intermixture of vanity. 'Most people,' he writes, 'dislike vanity in others, whatever share they have of it themselves; but I give it fair quarter wherever I meet with it, being persuaded that it is often productive of good to the possessor and to others that are within his sphere of action; and therefore in many cases it would not be altogether absurd if a man were to thank God for his vanity among the other comforts of life.' His model of life was adapted rigidly to the ordinary circumstances of humanity. If men seemed in fact to be substantially the better off for indulgence in any particular quality, Franklin complaisantly inserted that quality among his virtues. He was always more ready to admit a new candidate for his Olympus than to risk rejecting an addition to the sum of human happiness. He himself believed in a Providence, and apparently in 'a particular Providence;' but he was not disposed to deny to others the right to disbelieve. When, however, Thomas Paine, whom for his

work on Common Sense he had warmly patronised, submitted to him a MS. work against 'a particular Providence,' he earnestly dissuaded its publication. He urged not only the odium it would bring upon the author, but the danger of withdrawing from the weak, the ignorant, the inexperienced, and the inconsiderate, the support which religion affords to virtue. His ideas on the origin of evil were probably not very completely developed. But he thought a Devil very useful for the punishment of criminal wretches who cheated starving orphans of the alms entrusted for their relief. Whatever quality could prove by results that it had contributed to render life more harmonious he was glad to enshrine in his Pantheon, as Romans borrowed foreign gods. His ideal, both in morals, in religion, and even in politics, was purely inductive. He examined life and history to see in what circumstances of belief and education and government men had enjoyed happiness. The same circumstances might not have suited his character; but he was content not to disturb what appeared to suit others.

One province of his nature there was in which, so far as we are permitted to penetrate it, he was not always weighing the dangers of zeal to the evenness of the balance he was constantly engaged in trimming. In natural science he was an enthusiast; but that was a matter for himself and not for the outside world. He just mentions in his Autobiography the fact of his electrical experiments, and 'the rise and progress of my 'philosophical reputation,' between 1746 and 1753, when the Royal Society bestowed its medal. But his autobiography contains nothing more on the subject, and his correspondence very little. When his views were opposed, he was content to leave them to the judgment of posterity. He writes to an admirer in 1777: 'I have never entered into any controversy 'in defence of my philosophical opinions. If they are right, 'truth and experience will support them; if wrong, they ought 'to be refuted and rejected.' He had been told King George had exchanged the rebel Franklin's favourite pointed conductors for blunt ones. 'If I had a wish about it,' remarks Franklin, 'it would be that he had rejected conductors altogether as ineffectual.' Science was too grand a thing for him to care to confuse it with controversy. He would gaily dispute upon metaphysics and morals and politics, but upon the philosophy of nature never. Though he loved riches reasonably, he would not mix up so sublunary an application of science even as a stove with money. This typical American was so un-American in one respect as to set his face against monopolies in inven-

tions. Yet even his love of science he controlled by the sense of other duties. He earnestly deprecates a friend's design to try a balloon journey across the Channel in 1785 as a risk unfair to his family.

Except in science, so far as direct personal influence over posterity is concerned, Franklin did not go the way to secure it. 'Poor Richard' was a great power in his own time, for the very cause that the object of his mission was not very sublime. But for the making of a hero and a leader in the ages to come there must be some admixture of divinity. In Franklin's teaching there was nothing but what had been found in human life as it was. The teaching was after all ignoble. The world tired of it when it had come to perceive that the ideal propounded was nothing but ordinary prosaic humanity with something pruned off it. While the teacher survived there was a strength and freshness about his doctrines which came from the man himself, and kept the whole sweet and pure. Whatever his doctrines might be, the man was not ignoble. He was somewhat earthy perhaps, but he was great in himself; he was greater in his power over himself. His fame was common to two continents, and bridged the ocean. If George Washington saved America from being overrun by German mercenaries, and American liberties from being dragged in the mire by the British Parliament, it was Franklin who had made Americans too proud to consent to be slaves; it was Franklin who took the new-born State by the hand and seated it among the nations of the earth.

We have left ourselves space for only a few words on the distinctive characteristics of Mr. Bigelow's picture of Franklin's personal and political career. Mr. Bigelow reminds his readers that seventy-four years ago this Journal censured the want of literary enterprise in the United States of America, and of literary curiosity in the English public, which allowed the works of the 'only' American philosopher to remain dispersed in isolated volumes and the pages of forgotten pamphlets and periodicals. The 'Edinburgh Review' of 1806 could pardon the dearth of English and American enlightenment or gratitude in consideration solely of the greater crime it found reason to charge against the natural heir of Franklin's fame and the Tory Ministry of 1795. Franklin designated as his literary executor the grandson whom he had educated, and whom he loved the more for estrangement through political differences from his Royalist son, who had been Governor of New Jersey under the Crown, and finally became a British pensioner. This grandson, William Temple Franklin, was

believed by Jefferson and by many Frenchmen, as well as by the 'Edinburgh Review,' to have abused the trust by accepting a bribe from the British Government to keep from the world, at any rate for many years, the precious papers in his possession. He came from America a few months after his grandfather's death in 1790, for the express purpose of arranging with London booksellers for the publication of the autobiography and other documents. He made continual statements to the effect that he was engaged in the negotiation, yet the work was not given to the world until 1817. The autobiography of Franklin had indeed become famous throughout the civilised world. But it was known only at second hand. By some means or other, which have never been disclosed, a French naturalist, a Dr. Jacques Gibelin, obtained the use of a copy. This copy, which comprises only eighty-seven pages of the 220 of Franklin's manuscript, Gibelin translated into French in 1791. From Gibelin's French it was translated back again into English. 'To this day,' writes Mr. Bigelow, this version 'continues to be republished by some of the largest houses, not only in Europe, but in America, under the impression that it is both genuine and complete.'

Mr. Bigelow thinks he has detected a probable cause of the deferred fulfilment of the commission to publish Franklin's works and of the disappearance of some of them. In a letter now for the first time published to one of Franklin's closest friends, M. le Veillard, William Temple apologises for not paying a promised visit to Paris on business connected with the promised publication, on the plea that he 'could not possibly leave while a business I had undertaken was pending, for which I received a salary, and which, being now completed, affords me a profit of seven thousand pounds sterling.' Mr. Bigelow is incredulous of the reality of a business for which this young man, a stranger to London and an American citizen, could receive a salary so liberal as to secure to him in six months a profit of 7,000*l*. The salary, capitalised in a sum of 7,000*l*., Mr. Bigelow believes to have been a bribe for postponing a publication which, it might be supposed, would reopen the springs of popular indignation against the folly which had cost Great Britain a splendid empire. The great French war was like a flood. It washed away all memories of those old griefs. In 1817 William Temple Franklin could publish his grandfather's most solemn warnings to mole-eyed British statesmen of 1770 and 1780 without exciting remorseful fears in any politician's breast or

risking a claim for the recoupment of a fee of which he had not executed the conditions.

Mr. Bigelow is not able to prove his charge to absolute demonstration. But he has established a very strong presumption that Franklin's faith in this William Temple, this adopted child of his old age, was another of the philosopher's 'errata,' as he would himself have said. Happily William Temple had not much opportunity to try his editorial dexterity on very valuable material. Most of his grandfather's writings had already become part of the national literature, or rather of the literature of two nations. Any tampering with them would have speedily been exposed. It might have been apprehended that he could have attempted emendations with successful secrecy in the autobiography. It is even conceivable that, but for a combination of fortunate circumstances, he might have had both the will and the power finally to suppress a work which, in some particulars, would offend family pride. His grandfather had, however, insured its general safety, and he had himself unintentionally guarded the text from corruptions. Franklin, after writing it in his extreme old age, charged another grandson, Benjamin Bache, to execute one fac-simile, if not two, by means of a copying press, for the information of his Parisian friend, Le Veillard, and his English friend, Benjamin Vaughan. Whether the copy promised to Vaughan was ever made and sent has never been ascertained. The French version of the autobiography, which was published in Paris in 1791 by M. Jacques Gibelin, it is conjectured, may have been rendered from it. At all events, M. le Veillard received his copy. The original, with many corrections by Franklin himself, and eight additional pages which were not reproduced in Le Veillard's copy, descended to William Temple with the rest of his grandfather's papers. Had the edition of 1817 been printed from the original, it would have been impossible to prove that Franklin had not himself made the changes which distinguish that edition from others. It so happens, however, that William Temple, when he was still intending to publish the work with all despatch, had persuaded M. le Veillard to give him his copy in exchange for the original. His motive was the facility the printers would have in printing from the fair copy. The original Mr. Bigelow, while United States' Minister in Paris, was so fortunate as to obtain from the representatives of M. le Veillard. On collating it with William Temple's edition of 1817 he detected more than twelve hundred alterations. William Temple, or some literary man employed by him to correct the

press, had obviously been offended by his grandfather's racy diction. We give a few alterations merely as samples. 'Sotting 'with brandy' is rendered into 'drinking of brandy.' 'A 'very large' library becomes 'a considerable' one; 'dramming' is paraphrased by 'dram-drinking'; 'great guzzlers of beer' is politely softened into 'great drinkers of beer'; 'footed it to 'London' is turned into 'walked to London'; 'behaved very 'oddly' into 'behaved himself very extravagantly'; 'with the 'blessing of God' into 'thanks to Providence'; and 'Keimer 'stared like a pig poisoned' into the correct and respectable expression, 'Keimer stared with astonishment.'

Franklin's autobiography is one of mankind's greatest literary possessions. General gratitude is due to Mr. Bigelow for presenting it at last in the exact shape in which it issued from the author's memory. At least equal thanks are his right for the loyalty with which he has himself shown the reverence for his subject which he convicts William Temple Franklin of having violated. He has effaced himself, and been content simply to reflect Benjamin Franklin. He has been willing to let the man speak in his own person, and not by the mouth of Mr. John Bigelow. In three volumes all the many sides of the diplomatist, philosopher, moralist, cannot be pictured in full. His scientific achievements, which illuminated every act of his life, appear in these pages only as passing interludes in a busy political career. His State papers, models as they are of lucid argument, are not quoted, but only the conclusions at which they aimed. His system of ethics is revealed by a gleam here and a gleam there. But throughout the work we are conscious of the presence of a living man. At the end of it we feel that we have been conversing with one who did more than all others to rend away the great American colonies from the British Empire; yet we part company with no sense of unkindness towards the author of our loss.

ART. III.—1. *Le Mahométisme en Chine et dans le Turkestan Oriental*. Par P. DABRY DE THIERSENT, Consul-Général et Chargé d'affaires de France. 2 vols. Paris: 1878.

2. *Prières des Musulmans Chinois*, traduites sur l'original en arabe et en persan *Da'auât el-Moslemin*, imprimé à Canton en 1876. Paris: 1878.

3. *The Life of Yakooß Beg, Athalik Ghazi, and Baudalet, Ameer of Kashgar*. By DEMETRIUS CHARLES BOULGER. London: 1878.

4. *Religion in China*. By JOSEPH EDKINS, D.D. Second edition. London: 1878.

THE history of Mohammedanism is a series of surprises. Islam began by astonishing the world in its original outburst, and ever since, from time to time, it has ministered to the Western craving for amazement. Not many years ago people had made up their minds that the religion of Mohammed was passing into its stage of dotage, and that no more advance was to be looked for in a faith that was at last about to verify the predictions of its Christian 'unveilers,' and to die the death of all falsehoods. But more recently, the eyes that were thought to be shut for ever upon the forward march of Islam were roughly awakened to several unwelcome facts about that creed. It appeared from incontrovertible testimony that Mohammedanism was advancing with giant strides in Western Africa at the expense of Christianity, and that Muslim teachers were working a social reform where Christian missionaries had failed. It was discovered that an able resolute man had founded a vast Muslim kingdom between Russia and China, in the very centre of Asia, the cradle of the nations of Christian Europe; and in 1872 an appeal to England on behalf of an important Mohammedan kingdom in Southern China conveyed to Western ears the information that there were villages and towns and districts of Muslims in the midst of the Buddhist and Confucian inhabitants of the Celestial Empire. There are some who would assign to China a great part in the future of the world; and though it is hard to feel much apprehension whilst the empire is in its present divided and exhausted condition, it is possible that, with the help of the fiery religion of the Arabs, the Chinese might be induced to bestir themselves and set out on a career of conquest which should reflect not unworthily the violence and the terror of the first flood of Saraccenic invasion. The place of Islam in the

future of China must determine in a great degree the place of China in the future of Asia.

There is no religion about which so much is ill-known as Islam. It is hardly saying too much to assert that the barest fundamental doctrines of Mohammedanism are either unknown or misknown by the vast majority of educated Englishmen. University preachers of the highest honours still denounce the creed which teaches *the worship of Mohammed* along with the worship of God! Such ignorance of the essence of this religion is combined with equal darkness in the matter of its extent and present condition. In England, whose 40,000,000 Muslim subjects in India would, if the creed of the majority constituted the State religion, almost make Great Britain a Mohammedan power, the importance of the study of Islam and of the knowledge of its progress and possibilities in the future cannot longer thus be lightly ignored. Mohammedanism is closely linked with the future of India and of China, and through them with the future of Russia and of England. It is, therefore, a fit subject for regret that it should have been left to a French consul to inform us of that which so nearly touches our interests; but, whatever the source, it is the information that we want, and we owe our thanks to M. de Thiersant for the valuable service he has rendered to all whom the present and future condition of Chinese Mohammedanism may concern. He has gathered together a large quantity of really important materials, and his work deserves the careful study not merely of Orientalists and general readers, but of statesmen. It must, however, be admitted that the manner of the work is not so excellent as its intention. The Parisian much-vaunted virtue of conciseness is here conspicuously absent. M. de Thiersant has filled two volumes with the matter of one, and he has arranged the matter in a troublesome and irrational form. He has inserted a number of literal translations of decrees and the like, most of which are identical in purport, and of which one would have sufficed as a specimen of all. He has spread out into a series of chapters the history of Islam in the various provinces in a very unconnected manner, instead of giving a concise chapter on the history of Mohammedanism in all China. And his second volume, containing the ritual and creed, might have been easily and effectually condensed, for the Hanafy doctrine and practice of the Chinese Muslims differ in no essential manner from the orthodox creed in the rest of the Mohammedan world; and the comments and explanations of the Chinese theologians are scarcely worth printing at length. Finally, M. de Thiersant would have done well

if he had given the authorities for his statistics, and had, generally speaking, placed the book on a more positive basis as an authoritative exposition of facts. In spite of these defects, 'Le Mahométisme en Chine' is a valuable work, and bears on its surface the impression of fidelity to truth and personal experience.

Those who know anything of Arabian history, or even of the 'Arabian Nights,' will find nothing surprising in the introduction of Islam into China. The trade of the far East passed in a great measure through Arab hands to Syria and the ports of the Levant. In the sixth century there was a brisk commerce between Arabia and the 'Flowery Land' by way of Ceylon; and at the beginning of the Tang dynasty, in the first quarter of the seventh century, the trade between China and Persia and Arabia was greatly extended. Siraf, in the Persian Gulf, was the entrepôt of the Chinese merchants, who seldom came further west; and here the Arab traders from Maskat and Syria met them and carried their goods on to the next stage. An official journal records a voyage from China to Persia as taking over a year; but the travellers must be admitted to have taken their journey very leisurely. Among the traders who came to China early in the Tang dynasty, i.e. just when Mohammed was preaching to his Arabs, were men from Medina.

'The kingdom of Medina,' says the Chinese record, 'is near that of India; and it is in this kingdom that these strangers' religion arose, which is quite different from that of Fo (Buddha). They eat no pork, and drink no wine, and hold impure all flesh but what they have themselves killed. They call them now-a-days Hoey-Hoey. They had a temple (at Canton), called the "Temple of Sacred Memory," which was built at the beginning of the Tang dynasty. By the side of the temple was a tower, called the "Unadorned Tower," round, and 160 feet high. These strangers used to go every day to this temple to perform their ceremonies. Having asked and obtained the Emperor's leave to reside in Canton, they built themselves magnificent houses, of a different style from the architecture of our country. They were very rich, and obeyed a chief of their own choosing. They were so numerous, and so influential in their wealth, that they could maltreat the Chinese with impunity.'—*Mah. en Chine*, vol. i. pp. 19, 20.

Who these first importers of Islam to China were, their descendants are entirely at a loss to inform us. They were certainly Arabians, for they have left their faces to their posterity; but from what part of Arabia it is perhaps impossible to say. They may have been sent by Mohammed himself in the year when he sent ambassadors to all the great kings to call them to 'the true religion;' or they may have formed part of an

expedition of exiles, like those who emigrated, by their Prophet's advice, to Abyssinia. The only thing certain appears to be the early date of their arrival: there were undoubtedly Muslims in China about the end of the first quarter of the seventh century, or at least within ten years after the Hijra.

Who the chief of these men, the first Mohammedan missionary in China, was, is another obscure question. He is certainly a distinct person, about whom they preserve traditions, but he is not easy to identify. M. de Thiersant produces an inscription, dated 1351 A.D. (or rather its Chinese equivalent), which testifies that there was a special apostle sent in early times to the Chinese from Arabia; but the name throws no light on the identity of this apostle beyond the fact that he was a *Sahhâby*, or 'companion' of Mohammed.

'At the foot of the Mountain of White Snows is a very high tower, built by the exertions of a man of the West, under the dynasty of the Ly-Tang. The great saint of the West, Mohammed, whose disciples turn towards the holy stone in praying, sent one of his companions (*Sa-ka-pa*) to China to propagate his religion, some 800 years ago. It took a year and more for this disciple to reach our land by sea; he landed at Canton, and traversed China, and began to establish his religion at Canton.'—*Mah. en Chine*, vol. i. p. 22.

This apostle, variously styled Sarta, Sa-ka-pa, Wang-ka-ze, M. de Thiersant identifies, but we think on doubtful grounds, with Wahb Abu-Kebsha, a maternal uncle of Mohammed. Whoever he was, it seems clear that this apostle reached China about the sixth or seventh year of the Hijra (A.D. 628-9), where he was graciously received by the Emperor Tai-Tsung, who permitted him to build a mosque at Canton and to practise the rites of the Mohammedan religion. Returning to Arabia in 632, he found his Prophet was dead, and so chagrined was Sa-ka-pa at this disaster that he went back at once to Canton, bearing with him Abu-Bekr's authorised Koran, and there he died; and thither do many pious Muslims resort each year to pay respect to the tomb of the first Mohammedan missionary of China.

Islam, once planted in the Celestial Empire, speedily grew and waxed powerful. The scanty group of Arab traders settled at Canton multiplied, partly by new arrivals, partly by marriage with the Chinese, and by conversions. In 755 they received a considerable reinforcement in the 4,000 Muslim soldiers who were sent by the 'Abbâsy Khalif, El-Mansûr, to aid the Emperor Suh-Tsung against the rebel Gan Luh-Shan, and who, when they had done their fighting, were permitted to settle in China and take left-handed wives from among the

natives. This alliance between the Khalif of Baghdad and the Emperor of China is not so surprising as at first sight it would appear. The two empires were nearer to each other than one is accustomed to think. When, in the first century of the Hijra, the famous Muslim general Kuteyba crossed the Oxus, took Bukhara and Samarkand, and 'carried fire and sword through Kashgar to beyond Kucha,' he was actually on Chinese territory. He sent ten officers of his staff as deputies to the Emperor of China, who should offer him the friendship of the Khalif, if he submitted himself and paid an annual tribute to the court of Islam, which was then at Damascus; or, in case of refusal, should put before him the alternative of fire and sword, the burning of cities, the slaughter of men, and the enslaving of women and children, throughout the dominions of his Majesty. This audacious message was delivered with the customary *sang-froid* of the Arab. The ambassadors indulged the Emperor with an allegory in dress. The first day they appeared before him in sumptuous attire, perfumed *à ravir*, and, having regarded the Emperor in grave silence, immediately retired. The next day they came in rich garments of a sombre hue, and acted as before. The third day they presented themselves armed cap-a-pe, and wearing an exceeding fierce aspect. The Emperor, who had been at some pains to receive them with honour, could no longer restrain his amazement at this solemn rite, and demanded the reason thereof. 'The first day's dress,' they said, 'is that in which we visit our wives; in the second we go to Court; the third is what we wear when we encounter our enemies.' And then they delivered their message. The Arabian legend will have it that the Emperor was so much struck by the bearing of these men and the boldness of their language, that he loaded them with honours, and cheerfully consented to pay tribute to the distant Khalif. Without committing ourselves to the truth of this conclusion, this much is certain, that the Khalif and the Emperor were ever afterwards on very cordial terms, and were in the habit of sending each other costly presents, and, generally speaking, holding out the right hand of fellowship. The motive for this alliance is easily found in the fact that the two empires were equally subject to the marauding inroads of their common enemy the Thibetans, who lay between the two, and required suppression on both sides if they were to be kept in order at all.

The Arab traders, augmented by the 4,000 military colonists, prospered and multiplied in the land. The only important accession they received from outside consisted in the

Tatar and other immigrations which followed the general disturbance of Asia by Jenghiz Khan, and in prisoners of war taken during that period of universal fighting. But internally they grew steadily, and needed little fresh blood from without. Besides taking Chinese women as concubines, they increased their stock by the purchase of Chinese children in times of famine, and these they brought up as members of the Muslim community, and established, when fully grown, on their own account, so that whole villages were formed of these purchased Mohammedans.

‘For four centuries these strangers, envied by the natives for their political immunities, enjoyed a thousand facilities for development and for the formation of a populous and healthy community. Forced by their religious law to marry among themselves, they gradually took to them Chinese concubines, and were not slow to lose the diversity of types which distinguished them at the time of their arrival in China; and thus there sprang up a race distinct from the Chinese, and at the same time in no manner recalling its mixed origin.’ (Vol. i. p. 48.)

M. de Thiersant’s description of this peculiar race agrees closely with those of the learned Lazarist missionary, l’Abbé David, and of M. Dupuis and Mr. Anderson. Of course the characteristics differ somewhat in the different provinces and districts, according as one influence or another has been principally exerted; but, speaking generally, the Arab, Tatar, and Chinese blood which went to make up the people can be traced everywhere, and yet none of the three predominates so as to obscure the others, but rather all three unite in forming a new and distinct type, differing from all others and from its original ingredients. These Chinese Muslims are well-made fellows, of an athletic build, and, though seldom very tall, they are above the average Chinese height, altogether bigger and more muscular than the Chinese. The face is a long oval, with prominent cheek-bones; they have the Arab nose, but slightly sloping eyes that would be almost Chinese save for their fierce keen glance. They wear only a short moustache, and shave the rest of the face. Their Arab lineage asserts itself in the white or green turban, and they carry themselves with the dignified bearing of their Bedawy forefathers. The women are smaller than the men, the hips wide, and the bosom fully developed; their hands and feet very small, in consequence no doubt of Chinese customs; but the lower classes do not cramp the feet of their children after this fashion. The skin of both sexes is either whiter or browner than the olive-yellow of the Chinese; the hair is generally black, but sometimes one meets with a positively blonde colour. In

character they are described as gentler and more truthful than the other Chinese. As traders their honesty is above suspicion; as magistrates they are impartially just, and are looked up to with reverence. They are naturally more energetic than other Chinamen, and prefer war and commerce to art and letters. In religion they are not fanatical, but go so far in the contrary direction that they are willing to surrender such details in their ritual and creed as may seem offensive to the customs and prejudices of China. They dwell together in singular harmony, like a great good-tempered family, mutually protecting each other, and living in charity one with another and with their unconverted neighbours.

Colonel Yule, in an excellent introduction prefixed by him to Captain Gill's narrative of his journey to Tibet, which bears the somewhat affected title of 'The River of Golden Sand,' has pointed out that in Indo-Chinese countries Islam has never assimilated the nationality of those who profess it, as in Western Asia. This is the case in some degree in Java, still more so in Burmah, and most of all in China. The people in those countries professing Islam may be compared to the Abyssinian professors of Christianity. As we travel further east, the manners, rites, and observances prescribed by the common faith are considerably modified.

M. de Thiersant has devoted a whole volume of five hundred pages to the religion of these Muslims of China—a very needless waste of time and paper, as we think. It is divided into three large sections: (1) dogmatic, (2) moral, (3) ritual, occupying from 150 to 200 pages apiece, although each might have been sufficiently explained in a single chapter of very moderate length. The first part describes the necessary *dogmas* of Islam, as they exist all over the world among the orthodox—complicated and clouded over with the usual refinements and adumbrations of the divines, or such of them as the Chinese mind affects. The curious thing is, that these Muslims of China almost all belong to the orthodox sect of the Hanafys, and yet contrive to be tolerant and sociable with their infidel neighbours. Orthodox Islam is not wont to be so. Beyond this general fact, that orthodoxy and tolerance are compatible in Islam, there is nothing to be learned from M. de Thiersant's treatises on God, and angels, and jinn, and prophets, and sacred books, and resurrection, judgment, paradise, and hell. On the subject of predestination, however, the extracts from the Tsin-tchen-tche-nan are important, for they show that the dangers of fatalism are clearly comprehended by the Mohammedans of China, and that they can reconcile in their own minds an

orthodox belief in predestination with a firm conviction of man's responsibility and freedom of action. Whilst they recognise the doctrine that all the physical facts of the universe are the results of the immutable decrees of God, they also assert that actions of a moral order hang on the will of man, who is free to choose the good and eschew the evil.

The *moral* law of the Chinese Muslims is more interesting, because in it there is more room for the display of national and local peculiarities. The account of this law, however, in M. de Thiersant's second volume, is indescribably tedious. It consists mainly in extracts from Chinese moral treatises, which abound in excellent precepts for men and women's conduct in all the relations of life, but which do not present any strikingly original thought, and indeed seem to have a special power of giving forth distressingly 'goody' platitudes in a solemn way, which provokes unseemly mirth in the reader. If the Mohammedans of China were all that these moral essays say they ought to be, we should know where to go for a Utopia. They begin with the portrait of an ideal sovereign, who is one with his people, and whom his people worship as the shadow of God, and then proceed to describe the duties of public functionaries; after which family virtues have their turn—the duties of parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and friends, all of which are treated with extreme good sense, but somehow remind us of the copybooks, and do not strike us as likely to be more efficient in their influence than these same instructors of our childhood. Then the minor duties of the Muslim are explained—where he should dwell, how he must feed, and what he must avoid. This last category includes not merely the ordinary Mohammedan restrictions as to wine and the like, but also tobacco. The Chinese Muslims, like the Wahhabys, look upon smoking with unfeigned horror: they say the devil invented it when Nimrod cast Abraham into the furnace, in order to prevent the patriarch from escaping the flames. Opium, however, is not, unfortunately, regarded with such aversion. Dancing is not only forbidden, but unknown in China. Music, vocal and instrumental, the singing of spiritual psalms and the trolling of profane songs, are equally placed under a severe interdict. Images of living things are eschewed, as among all Muslim communities; but the Mohammedans of China, it must be confessed, do sometimes indulge their vanity by getting themselves photographed. Various regulations as to dress, usury, polite behaviour, public prayers, pilgrimage to Mekka, alms, and the like, are included in this part of the work; and these differ in no essential manner

from the ordinary rules of all Muslim societies. The truth is, that the mere description of the Koran law is of no possible use; for the Muslims of China are bound in many things to conform to the ordinary law of the land, whilst in others the regulations of Mohammed are modified by contact with other religions and customs. In marriage, for example, the Chinese law holds good: a Muslim in China can have but one wife, though, with her permission, he may take any number of concubines, who act as servants to the chief wife. The good and the bad points of Muslim marriage are traceable in China, with the improvement of the Chinese form of monogamy. The good side is seen in the rareness of illicit intercourse in the case of either sex. The bad side comes out in the degraded views of women which are common to all Mohammedan societies. Among the Chinese Muslims, the chief wife is simply 'la première servante de la maison;' and though she has seldom to complain of harshness or cruelty in her husband, her inferior position naturally produces a corresponding inferiority in character. Generally an affectionate and virtuous wife and mother, she is yet as ignorant as all women must be who are kept down by the low estimation of the men, and she is consequently unfit to train and educate her children in that time of their life which is perhaps the most important for the firm implanting of high principles and an intelligent view of life. Although the sexes are separated in the ordinary Mohammedan fashion (but without the veil), the Chinese wife enjoys much more liberty than her sisters in Egypt and Turkey. Yet this liberty seldom leads to immorality, and the Mohammedan ladies of China, though self-indulgent and given over to opium-smoking, are very reserved and modest in their behaviour. Among the lower classes, the women show to the best advantage; they share every labour of their husbands with the utmost energy and devotion, and are rewarded by real affection and constancy. Few men of the working classes have more than the one wife; but among the traders and government officials about two-fifths keep a harem of several women. It is a singular fact that it is often the chief wife who urges the husband to take secondary wives (who are simply purchased slaves), either, like Sarai of old, on account of her own barrenness, or because she wishes to increase her domestic establishment; for these concubines are more thoroughly under the control of the chief wife than any other servants could be, and they not seldom suffer many hardships and indignities at her hands. The Chinese Muslim system of one chief wife is certainly an advance upon the system of other Mohammedan

societies; but in the matter of concubines, and in the general ignorance and inferior position of women, it tallies only too well with what we know of all communities where the social system of the Koran is in force.

As to the third division of the second volume, concerning the *ritual*, little need be said. The trivial and wearisome regulations as to purifications and prayers, fasts and festivals, and the ceremonies of births, marriages, and deaths, are those observed throughout the Mohammedan world, and it was quite unnecessary to recapitulate them in this work.

The Mohammedans of China are by no means equally distributed over the empire. Of the 20,000,000 Muslims who enjoy the protection of the Emperor, nearly three-fourths are found in the north-west provinces of Kan-suh and Shen-si, and 4,000,000 inhabit (or, we should rather say, inhabited before the massacre of the Panthays) the fertile south-west province of Yun-nan; so that only about 1,150,000 remain for all the other provinces.* The original settlement in the province of Kwang-tung, where the commercial interests common to Muslims and Chinese made a peaceful *modus vivendi* imperative at the beginning, became in later times the scene of the massacre by Huang-chow, which was followed by the migration of the Muslims to the island of Hainan, where their four mosques are still in existence; and Kwang-tung, with its twelve mosques, five of which are in the capital, Canton, itself, now holds scarcely more than 20,000 believers in the creed which the Arab traders brought first to its port, and their numbers are ever on the decrease.

Islam has flourished in China as no other foreign religion, if we except Buddhism; and it is worth while to discover how this has happened. It is not because there is any special affinity between Islam and the state religion of China, although imperial decrees would have us allow a close resemblance between them. It is because the Muslims of China have under-

* M. de Thiersant gives the following figures for the Mohammedan population of the various provinces. It is much to be regretted that he does not state the source of his statistics.

Kan-suh	8,350,000	Shan-si	50,000
Shen-si	6,500,000	Hu-nan, Hu-pih	50,000
Yun-nan	4,000,000	Sze-chuen	40,000
Chih-li	250,000	Kwei-chow	40,000
Shan-tung	200,000	Che-kiang	30,000
Ho-nan	200,000	Kwang-tung	21,000
Kiang-su	150,000	Kwang-si	15,000
Shing-king	100,000	Kiang-si	4,000

stood in a very remarkable manner the duties of a minority, and have recognised the hardest necessity of dissent—the necessity of preferring the obligations of the subject to the prescriptions of a nonconforming creed. It is really astonishing to read how these Mohammedans of China have brought themselves to give up what was local in their religious ordinances, and to accommodate themselves as citizens to the laws and customs of the Chinese Empire. They have adopted the habits and often the dress of the rest of the people, and have so far softened the intolerance and fanaticism that we are accustomed to regard as inherent in the religion of Mohammed that they are able to live amicably with the infidels, and to regard their Buddhist neighbours with a kindly feeling which it would be hard to find in a mixed community of Catholics and Evangelicals such as some English country towns present for the edification of our modern Gallios. They join in the public amusements, and behave altogether like ordinary Chinamen, only better; and anything that annoys their neighbours, as tall minarets, for example, they studiously avoid.

This loyalty and orderliness of the Muslim population in China has been met by a similar spirit of tolerance and kindness on the part of the supreme rulers. The Muslims of China labour under no disabilities; they are eligible for all offices; and the intelligent and worthy manner in which they fulfil the duties confided to them proves the wisdom of the sovereigns who did not fear to trust them. The Emperors of China have had no better and abler servants than their Muslim officials; as ministers of State, members of the highest councils of the realm, generals of the Celestial army, and governors of provinces, they have fully justified the confidence reposed in them. The Emperors of China have always impressed upon their subjects the triviality of slight dogmatic differences, provided the religion in question produces good citizens and kind-hearted helpful neighbours; and the Muslims in return have sought to find points in common with Confucianism, instead of differences.

‘The Arab religion, says a Chinese writer of the eighteenth century, prescribes for the worship of the Supreme Being that which Confucius ordained for the Chang-ty: it only adds what has been borrowed from Buddhism, concerning prayer, fasting, alms, rewards and punishments after death, and certain rites.’—*Mah. en Chine*, vol. i. p. 54.

The Government has taken the same view of the stranger creed, and many imperial decrees remind the people that Islam only aims at teaching the doing of good and the observance of natural laws and social obligations; and, if it presents some

differences from other creeds, these are to be regarded simply as questions of country and custom, best understood by the founder of the creed. An extract from an imperial decree published in 1731, on the occasion of a Muslim objection to an edict respecting cattle, will show the kindly spirit which the Chinese emperors entertained towards Islam:—

‘In all the provinces of the empire there have been for many centuries a great number of Mohammedans, who form part of the people, and, like all my other subjects, are my very children. I make no distinction between them and those who do not belong to their religion. I have often received from certain functionaries secret complaints against the Mohammedans, because their religion differs from that of the other Chinese, because they do not speak the same language, because they wear different dresses from the rest: they accuse them of serious disobedience, of stiffneckedness, of a spirit of revolt; and they demand of me severe measures against them. After having examined these complaints and accusations, I have found them groundless. The religion which these Mohammedans practise is that of their forefathers. Their tongue in truth is not the same as the Chinese; but how many dialects are there not in China? As to their temples, their dress, their handwriting, which are not as those of the other Chinese, these things are of no account: they are mere questions of manners. Their character is every whit as good as that of my other subjects; and there is nothing to show that they have a mind to revolt. I will, then, that they be left freely to exercise their religion, which aims at teaching men to do good and to observe their social and civil obligations and duties. Their religion respects the fundamental bases of government: what more should I exact? Let the Mohammedans continue to bear themselves as good and loyal subjects, and my favour shall extend to them as to my other children. From their number have come many civil and military officials, who have attained to the highest ranks—the best of proofs that they have adopted our customs and know how to conform to the ordinances of our sacred books. They pass their examinations in letters like all the rest, and perform the sacrifices prescribed by the law. In a word, they are true members of the great Chinese family, in that they force themselves indefatigably to fulfil their religious, civil, and political duties.’ (Vol. i. pp. 155–6.)

So said the Emperor Yung-shing in 1731; and another emperor, regarding Islam in the same liberal light, maintained the doctrine that ‘religion is a matter of conscience, which no one has the right to scrutinise.’ Many edicts could be quoted couched in the like tolerant spirit, to which, and the appreciation thereof by the tolerated, the Muslims of China owe the peace and tranquillity they have generally enjoyed.

Whenever the Mohammedans have come into conflict with their neighbours, it has been the fault, not of the supreme government, but of its lower officials. The mandarins of the

provinces not unnaturally entertained feelings of jealousy towards the mixed people of foreign creed who had taken so firm a root in their land, and to whom the emperors showed marks of such decided favour. In the early days of Chinese Mohammedanism the Muslims were too few to resent the petty injuries of these understrappers by force, and in the central provinces the Muslim minority is still too small to be ever on anything but its best behaviour. In the troublesome south-west provinces, however, they sometimes forgot their policy of meek submission and conformity, and returned blow for blow. A slight quarrel between individuals of the different creeds would be followed by a conflict between the two whole parties, who would take up the quarrel of their co-religionist in the spirit of the Arab avengers of blood, or the Scottish clans in the good old days. Then would ensue massacres marked with all the cruelty of the Chinese character, added to the ferocity of religious warfare. The long suppression of spiritual rancour perhaps served only to intensify the fury of the fight, and things were done worthy of the best days of the Albigenian 'crusade' or the inculcation of the 'Thorough' principle in Ulster. In Kwei-chow, for example, in 1860, some litigation between a Muslim family named Ma and a Confucian called Tung resulted in a massacre of all the Muslims of the town. The neighbouring Mohammedans came to avenge them, and in turn massacred the whole of the Confucian population. The streets were so full of the dead that, in order to clear a way, they had to pile the bodies one atop of another against the walls of the houses, and the wounded were so entangled among the dead that they could not extricate themselves, and so perished miserably in the loathly heap. Famine followed hard on the heels of slaughter, and the people were reduced to eating human flesh. To bury dead persons came to be regarded as criminal waste: they ate them. No man dared walk abroad by himself for fear of being devoured by his hungry townsmen. The luckiest of mortals was he who lighted upon a corpse; he would carefully carry it to a secret place, cut it into convenient joints, dry it in the sun, and store it as the most precious of provisions; the bones went to make soup. Things came to such a pass that human flesh was actually sold in the public markets without a pretence of concealment. Happily, Monsignor Faurie succeeded in patching up the quarrel before it went any further, and since then it is said that perfect harmony has reigned in the province between the Muslims and the other Chinese.

In the contiguous province of Yun-nan these things were

carried out on a still larger scale. Here Islam was a comparatively late importation, but since its introduction in the thirteenth century it has marvellously increased, and until the last terrible revolt the Muslims formed the large majority of the population of the province. Up to the present century they seem to have received the same tolerant treatment as the rest of the Chinese Muslims, and the mineral wealth of the province, together with the trade with Burmah, contributed to bring about the unusual degree of prosperity which the Mohammedans of Yun-nan enjoyed at the beginning of this century; but the last seventy years have been filled with one long record of troubles and rebellions and merciless massacres. One of the worst of these disturbances took place in 1840, when, in consequence of the Muslims having offended two government officials, by claiming a just debt of one, and refusing to subscribe to a parasol of honour which it was proposed to present to the other, some 1,600 men, women, and children of the Mohammedan population of Momien were butchered without mercy, and the massacre would have been carried out through the rest of the district if the Muslims of the vicinity had not come to the rescue and exacted a terrible vengeance from the wanton oppressors of their co-religionists. But the most deplorable conflict between the Muslims and their neighbours in Yun-nan—or indeed in any part of China—was that which began in a quarrel between some miners in 1855, and only ended in 1874 in well-nigh the extermination of the Muslim population of the province. We have had occasion before to refer to this rebellion,* but M. de Thiersant's account is more detailed than any report we have hitherto seen. The Chinese miners of Lusun-fu killed a good many of their Mohammedan fellow-workmen; the Muslims retaliated, murdered the Chinese superintendents, who had made themselves detested by their oppressions; and the struggle began to assume alarming proportions. The Chinese called to their aid the national guard of the department; but the superior courage and solidarity of the Muslims gave the latter the advantage. The Futay, or governor of the province, was appealed to, and he, acting under the advice of a young Tatar, a member of the Academy of the Han-lin, ordered a general massacre of the Muslims throughout the province. Mounted expresses were despatched to the seventy-two districts with instructions to this effect to the principal mandarins. First, three hundred Muslim families of the town of Po-li were sur-

prised by night and butchered; their houses were sacked and their mosque burnt; then village after village was subjected to the same barbarous fate. A cry of horror rang through the province, and the Mohammedans rushed to arms and collected in vast numbers, thirsting for vengeance, and uncertain of the bare safety of their wives and children. A bold and energetic young military graduate, Ma-hien, took the command of the Muslim army, which invariably gained the victory over the government troops. In despair of reducing the rebels by force, the Futay had recourse to the alternative commonly adopted in China—of offering an amnesty to all the insurgents, and rank to their leaders. Matters were very near being thus arranged, when the news came that seven hundred Mohammedan families had been slaughtered in one town of the province, and that more than fifteen thousand Muslims had been massacred at three other places. When Ma-hien heard this, he ordered out the Futay's messengers of peace, and had them immediately shot; and then he marched with his army from town to town, ruthlessly slaughtering all who had taken part in the massacres, and destroying all that came in his way. He stated to M. Dupuis that on this march he killed upwards of a million Chinese. The provincial government was paralysed, the Foutay besieged in his capital, Ma-hien master of the greater part of the province. The central government had its hands full with the Taeping insurrection. There was nothing for it but to make terms. A complete amnesty was granted, peace signed, and Ma-hien raised to the dignity of a Tchintay.

One rebel chief alone refused to accept the terms of peace. Tu-wen-tsiew, afterwards known as the Emperor Suleymân, had seized Ta-ly-fu, in spite of its natural defences of lake and mountain, put the garrison to the sword, and soon found himself commander of an army of 80,000 men and master of the northern part of Yun-nan. He appointed eighteen governors for the various districts of his wide dominion, and, to show that he would have nothing in common with the emperor's subjects, he ordered his followers to wear their hair long. When Ma-hien and his colleague Lao-papa accepted the amnesty, Tu-wen-tsiew flatly refused to have anything to do with it; whereupon the two leaders of the war renounced him, and to their desertion is due the fall of Mohammedanism in Yun-nan. At first the nonjuring chief had things his own way. In 1860 he besieged the capital Yun-nan-fu with 100,000 men, and, though he failed to take it, ravaged the country round in the usual fashion of Chinese war. Anderson

states that seventy-seven towns were taken by assault, and forty of them absolutely destroyed, whilst the villages and hamlets burnt and pillaged defy calculation. In the first year of Tung-che the Imperial troops regained the command of the territory of the insurgents—or Panthays, as they were called by their Burmese neighbours—and in their turn besieged Ta-ly-fu. For three years they met with repeated repulses, and then raised the siege. A second siege only resulted in a similar retreat, and this time Tu-wen-tsiew retaliated by besieging the capital again, retiring, however, after six pitched battles. In 1870 the governor received orders from Peking to take Ta-ly-fu at all costs; and meanwhile Hitay-ly (who was accused of Mr. Margary's assassination in 1875, and owes his present safety to the diversion afforded by the Eastern Question to her Majesty's Government) attacked the other stronghold of the Panthays, Momien. The Muslim general of the earlier campaign, Mahien, reduced the smaller places to the Imperial sway.

Ta-ly-fu had been invested two years and more, and most of the besieged were giving up hope and counselling surrender, when Tu-wen-tsiew played his last card: encouraged by the friendly attitude of Major Sladen's expedition, he sent his adopted son, the Panthay Prince Hasan, to implore the aid of the greatest Mussulman power—the aid of England. Prince Hasan escaped from the beleaguered city with a few followers, and, reaching Rangoon, sailed for England. It lay then in our power to decide the future of an important Muslim kingdom wedged in between China and Burmah, where our political influence might have proved useful. 'Unfortunately,' as Mr. Bosworth Smith says, 'the interests of our trade were not sufficiently bound up with the existence of the Panthays to call for any representations on the part of a nation which, in spite of its higher instincts and aspirations, is still above all commercial.'* Mr. Gladstone's Government, influenced by considerations of neutrality, and deceived by reports of a cessation of hostilities in Yun-nan, received the prince with evasive cordiality; and the Sultan of Turkey, to whom he next applied, could not see his way to improve upon the polite negotiations of the British Ministry. Prince Hasan, foiled in his hope of succour from Christian or Muslim, returned to perish with his people. Arriving at Rangoon in December 1873, he learned that Ta-ly-fu had been given up

* Mohammed and Mohammedanism. 2nd edition, p. 30.

by treachery to the Imperial troops, that his father was dead, and the Panthay rebellion stamped out.

In fact, the intercourse between the Panthays and England had so greatly alarmed the Chinese Government that they resolved to throw their whole force into a final effort to crush the Mohammedan insurrection. So fiercely did they press the siege of Ta-ly-fu that the inhabitants lost hope, and at the end of 1872 some officers of the garrison, having opened negotiations with the besiegers, and being supported by the despair of the besieged, publicly insulted Tu-wen-tsiew, and told him he had no alternative but to go out to the besiegers and surrender the town. The chief saw that all was over, and that his influence could no longer restrain the malcontents; he went into his house, poisoned his three wives and five daughters, to save them from the brutality of the conquering army, and then, having provided himself with gold leaf, which he swallowed during the journey, he entered his palanquin, and was carried to the general who commanded the besieging army. Arrived at his tent, the Panthay chief, already dying from the poison, was beheaded. The general concealed his death, and, outwitting the traitorous officers, gained an entry into the city, and, after first decapitating the betrayers, gave the place over for three days to all that the cruelty and license of a barbarous soldiery could devise. Thirty thousand souls were put to the knife. Momien was taken in May; happily its garrison escaped by one way as the Imperial troops broke in by another. By the end of 1874 the rebellion was at an end, and the Emperor once more ruled over Yun-nan. The two Muslim generals who had turned against their own people did not long profit by their desertion. On a trumpety charge Lao-papa was beheaded at the age of eighty-six; and Mahien, after having been made a Titay and covered with distinction during the siege of Ta-ly-fu, was degraded, and now lives in Hu-nan, doubtless repenting his desertion of the cause he had once so gallantly upheld. Such was the end of the Panthay rebellion. The country is exhausted, and more than a fourth of its inhabitants have perished or emigrated.

Perhaps the most important province of China, regarded from the point of view of Mohammedanism, is that of Kansuh in the extreme north-west. It is interesting not only on account of the large number of its Muslim inhabitants—more than eight millions—but also because it formed the meeting-ground between the Chinese Empire and the kingdom of Yakooob Beg, the Atalik Ghazy of Kashgar. Stretching from this province to the northern frontier of Persia is the

vast undulating plain of Eastern Turkestan, a great sandy salt desert 3,000 feet above the sea level, but rising gently towards the east, dotted over here and there with oases spread on the banks of the rivers which go to form the Tarim, where dwell the sparse inhabitants of the desert, the Uzbek tribes, and the 12,000 tents of the Kirghiz, Muslims all, but more by profession than by any specially hearty conviction. This vast country formed part of the Celestial Empire before the ninth century, but subsequently broke away, and for many centuries suffered the miseries of Mongol rule, at the hands of a multitude of petty khâns, of whom Mr. Boulger says 'they possessed scarcely one redeeming quality among many vices.' In 1760, the Emperor of China invaded and subdued it, giving to its two great divisions of Eastern Turkestan and Zungaria combined the name of Ili, establishing a Manchu at Kulja, who, with two councillors and twenty-four residents, assisted by 60,000 troops, ruled the province. An insurrection, beginning at Singan-fu in Shen-si, and spreading to Kan-suh in 1862, in which the Tungani (a mysterious race of Mohammedans dwelling in that region, supposed to be the remnant of the armies of Kublai Khan) were the chief actors, led to the severance of a part of this province and the whole of the government of Ili from the Chinese Empire. Various small Mongol states sprang up on the ruins of this huge sovereignty, and their disunion might have given China an easy task in reasserting its supremacy if a man of singular ability had not joined together the scattered states under his own rule. In 1865 Yakoob Beg, having directed the siege and accomplished the capture of the citadel of Kashgar, having slaughtered the garrison and given over the town to a seven days' pillage by the soldiery, assumed to himself sovereign powers, with the title of Atalik Ghazy; and then proceeded to make himself master of the whole desert plateau, from Asiatic Russia to Thibet, and from Khiva to Kan-suh. A few vigorous measures sufficed to restrain the former rulers of the land, the Mongol Khojas; and, save for various futile attempts on the part of the Chinese to recover their lost territories, and a certain amount of trouble with his seditious neighbours the Tungani, the Atalik Ghazy enjoyed a reign of moderate tranquillity, and proved himself a just and enlightened ruler. The abolition of the slave trade throughout his dominions is sufficient evidence of his desire to approach the standard of civilised nations. The Atalik Ghazy's power was recognised by England, and, after repeated evasions, by Russia; and there seemed every probability of an enduring Muslim king-

dom being established in Central Asia, which might form an important item to be reckoned with in the future positions of China and Russia in the heart of the continent. In May, 1877, however, the Ameer died; and at the end of the year the Chinese troops marched upon Yarkand and Kashgar, and put an end to the hopes that had been entertained for the future of the youngest Mohammedan kingdom. The Chinese Emperor now holds his ancient sway over Eastern Turkestan, but the northern part of the province of Ili, called Zungaria, fell into the hands of Russia, only, however, to be eventually returned to China; for it has recently (August, 1879) been arranged in St. Petersburg to retrocede Kulja, the capital of Zungaria, for 5,000,000 roubles. The Chinese have always demanded the retrocession of this place, which, indeed, was only occupied by the Russians during a period of anarchy, and never fairly belonged to them: nor, indeed, did they pretend to claim it. It is therefore only just that China should recover what she has certainly a better right to than Russia; and, as to the indemnity, which will chiefly go to Russian traders, who claim it on account of losses suffered during the time of anarchy, that is imposed mainly for the sake of saving the dignity of the Czar. It appears, however, doubtful whether this treaty has been ratified by the Court of Peking.

The part that Russia has played in the politics of Central Asia hardly comes under the subject of this article, and is moreover not yet fully explained. Mr. Boulger has done his best to unravel the diplomatic mysteries of the relations between Russia and Kashgar in his 'Life of the Ameer Yakooob Beg,' but his account, animated as it is by a violently anti-Russian spirit, must be accepted with reserve. As our subject is Mohammedanism in China, and Mr. Boulger's book is mainly concerned with the history of Eastern Turkestan before it again became Chinese, we cannot enter into any adequate discussion of the merits of the work; but it is only fair to say that so far as it touches upon matters connected with the subject of this article, we have always found its information clear and abundant. It is to be regretted that Mr. Boulger has not obtained the services of a duly qualified orientalist to set him right on matters of Eastern scholarship; but faults of translation and spelling are no very serious blots in a work that is avowedly intended to be a popular biography. The book is full of instructive facts: Mr. Boulger has made himself a master of Central Asian history, and his account of Yakooob Beg forms a useful supplement to the works

on Kashgaria which we had recently occasion to notice in tracing the history of the revolt of Eastern Turkestan.

Yakoob Beg is dead, but the country he ruled is none the less Mohammedan; and, though exhausted and half exterminated, there are yet millions of the same faith in the devastated provinces of Yun-nan, Kan-suh, and Shen-si; and this Muslim population may be destined to mould the future of China, especially if Yun-nan is opened to trade by the route which it was the object of the expeditions of Major Sladen and Colonel Browne and the unfortunate Margary to establish. Twenty million Muslims in a population of four hundred millions may seem overweighted; but it must be remembered that the majority is in a disunited lifeless condition, whilst the minority is filled with an energy and confidence in the future, which the late terrible struggles have only served to strengthen. The Muslims are aware that it is no small thing to have withstood the whole power of a huge empire for nearly twenty years; and they look forward hopefully to a time of assured independence. The Chinese Government, on the other hand, is conscious of the strength of its Muslim subjects, and remembers that the armies of Ma-hien were only disbanded by an amnesty, and not by defeat. Hence the mandarins of the provinces treat the Mohammedans with cautious suavity, as a people on no account to be excited, and the Muslims on their side bear themselves peacefully and right loyally, waiting in all patience till their strength shall be restored, and their numbers multiplied, and the Chinese War of Independence shall begin.

‘China,’ says M. de Thiersant, ‘in its present condition, is at the mercy of the first great power whose covetousness its riches may provoke. All who have dwelt in it during the last few years can perceive how this ancient edifice, crannied from base to gables, shakes on foundations which time has undermined. The respect for authority, which, with love of the family, has hitherto upheld it, has been materially weakened by the endless insurrections which, since Tao-kwang, have reddened the soil. The central Government, without money, and one may say without the power of repression, is at infinite pains to retain the obedience of its four millions of subjects, who lay on its shoulders the blame of the disasters they have brought on themselves. Moreover, it has to reckon with their superstitions and their time-honoured prejudices. In the provinces the governors exhaust every contrivance in order to procure the funds which are required of them every instant from Peking for the general needs of the State: whence come the traffic of offices, the sale of justice, the arbitrary raising of the customs (of which the collectors absorb the profits), and consequently general discontent, which is fostered by the ceaseless intrigues of secret

societies, as well as by the words and writings of the literary men—that frivolous, ignorant, and vain class which takes egoism to be patriotism, and only thinks of upsetting everything, instead of using its intelligence and influence for the good of the country. As to the common folk, in general, given over to its instincts, its passions, discouraged by what it suffers and what it hears and what it sees, it ruminates from day to day on the reports and predictions which are circulated alike in country and town, and trembles as it thinks of the calamities which are in store for it in the future.’ (Vol. i. pp. 325–327.)

From an empire such as M. de Thiersant describes there is nothing to fear; for it, on the other hand, there is everything to fear. Supposing that the old Chinese fashion of *laissezaller* undergoes no change, and matters grow worse, disunion and discontent become aggravated, and the Government loses the little strength it has. What then? The Chinese Mohammedans, having recovered the ground they lost in the recent troubles, pluck up heart again and reduce the whole country. The army that could reduce the large province of Yun-nan twenty years ago would, in its developed state, be able to reduce all China fifty years hence if things go on as heretofore. The religious situation in China is so peculiar that it would not be surprising to find the people converted to any new creed. Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism exist side by side, and are equally accepted without distinction by the same individual. ‘It is quite a common thing,’ says Dr. Edkins, ‘for the same person to conform to all the three modes of worship. . . . Any divinity [the governing powers] may wish to have worshipped by the common people will be admitted at once into their pantheon without difficulty. The majority of the inhabitants comply with the worship of more than one religion, believe in more than one mythology of gods, and contribute to the support of more than one priesthood.’ Dr. Edkins’ conclusion is that China will become Christian; but the reasoning would lead equally well to the inference that it might become Mohammedan. China turned Muslim would be a very different thing from China inspired by no very hearty religious feeling. Four hundred millions of Mohammedans, added to the already large census of Islam, would materially alter the conditions of the European powers; and a Chinese ‘holy war’ would be a veritable Damocles’ sword suspended over the civilised world. Such things may be dreams, but they are not impossibilities; and such a contingency as the revivifying of China by the religion of Mohammed ought to be reckoned with in the future of all European States.

ART. IV.—*The Schools of Charles the Great and the Restoration of Education in the Ninth Century.* By J. BASS MULLINGER, M.A. London: 1877.

MODERN students recognise with much satisfaction the advantage they have derived from the numerous essays or monographs on special events or combinations in history, which, after being ‘crowned’ by the great French Academies, have been revised and expanded, so as to become substantial contributions to literature. We have done less in this way at home. Our careless youth are apt to be content to cast their bread upon the waters, and entrust their views on the subject that may chance to interest them to the open pages of a review or a magazine, with little expectation that they will be remembered or referred to beyond the month or quarter following. But it is very certain that the germs of what might have blossomed into works of permanent value have thus got trampled down in the struggle for existence. Modest merit, however great its promise, may require early recognition to bring to maturity the fruit which it bears implicitly within it. The real value of the prize-exercise is, of course, not in the work done, but in the direction it may give to the writer’s genius, and the impulse to further improvement upon his early efforts. Many of the clever essays thus encouraged in France by the Academy or the Institute have laid the foundation of a great literary career.

Mr. Mullinger’s book on the Schools of Charles the Great owes its origin to the Kaye Prize founded recently at Cambridge for the best dissertation on some subject of ancient ecclesiastical history by a ‘graduate of the university of not ‘more than ten years’ standing.’ The age of the candidates, we may observe, seems to be more nearly defined than the range of subject, for the ‘Schools of Charles the Great’ can hardly be called strictly ancient or strictly ecclesiastical. Without attempting to define the exact limits of the ancient and the modern, the eighth century may be taken to stand about midway between the two, and the social history of the ninth, as indeed of all other Christian centuries, partakes both of the civil and the ecclesiastical. Mr. Mullinger has moreover extended his subject somewhat beyond the distinct limits of time assigned him. He professes to ‘illustrate the connexion’ of his subject ‘with the commencement of the University of Paris, and of European university history at large,’ in three chapters in which he glances at the revival of classical and

metaphysical studies in the half-century after Charles's death, with which view he has obtained permission to make some additions to his work since the prize was awarded. This pretension is perhaps too ambitiously announced. Our own limits must confine us more closely. Nevertheless the little volume of 200 pages is a real gem of historical abridgment, and deserves a place among manuals of permanent value for the fulness of its information, the lucidity of its arrangement, its precision of style, and generally for the interest with which it is calculated to invest a byway of history which, though it has been surveyed by a Guizot, an Ampère, and an Ozanam among the French, is obscure at least to English readers, and has been little traversed by them. The writer may justly feel that it serves as a very suitable introduction to the full and important account of early studies at Cambridge which he published a few years ago.

The immemorial rivalry between 'arms and the gown,' or the attractions of active life and intellectual exercises, has been noted from very ancient times. The same races of mankind have displayed at different epochs equal energy in both the one pursuit and the other. The Gauls of old, the French, as we designate a people essentially the same with them in our own day, have exhibited alternately a restless activity both in arms and letters. So it was at the first. Cæsar described the Gauls as the most warlike of nations, a character well attested by the energy with which they had already made the tour of Europe and effected a permanent lodgment even in a corner of Western Asia. But when confined more closely within their own limits they were hardly less active in mental exertion. They were noted as eager and fluent speakers in their popular assemblies; they gave an earnest of their literary instinct by mastering the Greek characters in writing; such was their curiosity that they stopped strangers on their way, and questioned them about foreign parts. When their warlike tendencies were checked by the 'Roman Peace,' their intellectual appetites were all the more excited. The Gauls had fought gallantly for their freedom, but when that was lost they proved themselves singularly patient under the deprivation. The mutiny of their levies on the Rhine was a mere military disturbance; it met with no response from the body of the people; throughout the long period of Roman rule among them, there was no instance of a popular rising against the foreigner. But the Gauls continued to meet in their provincial councils for the transaction of local business; they exerted their natural volubility of speech both at the bar and in their

town halls; they devoted themselves from the first to the liberal cultivation of letters. The early emperors founded schools or colleges, doubtless for political purposes, at Bibracte or Autun, at Arles, which rivalled Autun as the 'Celtic Rome;' at Lyons, where rhetoric, we are told, was specially studied, and whence professors of the art were drafted into Britain, and were looked for, as was playfully remarked, even in the furthest Orkneys, the Polynesia of the Roman world. From the second century of our era many of the most eminent Latin writers were natives of Gaul, and made that country their residence. The Western Church, at first confined as a Greek colony to Rome, was soon planted in the broad province beyond the Alps, where it was favourably received, and where several of the early Latin doctors were born and bred. The most curious testimony to the love of letters among the ancient Gauls appears in the allusion of Ausonius to the school of rhetoric and grammar which flourished at Burdigala (Bordeaux) in the fourth century. This, indeed, was but one of many similar institutions, established at Clermont, Besançon, Vienne, Toulouse, Narbonne, and elsewhere at the same period. But the school of Bordeaux is specially distinguished by the notice which the poet, once its pupil, has given us of many of its professors, who are described, in long succession, as men of genius, learned in all the knowledge of antiquity, and who gained a deserved renown for their ability in imparting it.* One of them indeed, but one only, by name Marcellus, is lightly perstringed as 'præ-tenuis meriti;' but he, it seems, had migrated from Bordeaux to Narbonne. He did not fail, however, to get wealth and honours by his teaching, while his genius, or the reputation of it, secured him a matrimonial connexion with a noble family. Arborius, another of the number, was noble himself, both on the father's and the mother's side. Patera and Phœbicius boasted their descent from noble families of the Druidical priesthood. Glabrio pretended to trace his origin from the

* The little book of 'Professores,' in which five-and-twenty of these literati have each a poem devoted to his praise, ends with a comprehensive summary of the subjects on which they lectured :

'Valete manes inclytorum rhetorum,
Valete doctores probi;
Historia si quos vel poeticus stylus,
Forumve fecit nobiles;
Medicæ vel artis dogma vel Platonicum
Dedit perenni gloriæ.'

ancient Trojans. Their chairs were probably endowed from the municipal funds by the government; the University of Bordeaux in the fourth century was, we may suppose, maintained on the principles of the modern board school; we might even imagine, from the silence of Ausonius on the subject, that all denominational teaching was sternly forbidden in it. But though the teachers were not obliged to rely on their personal popularity for their livelihood, it is clear that they might make a very good thing of the fees of the pupils who flocked to them for training in the arts which paid best in after life. Debarred as they now generally were from the pursuit of military fame and fortune, the ingenuous youth of Gaul betook themselves with a light heart to the civil functions, which required an education in speaking and composition, a fund of general information, and, more perhaps than all, an ample stock of rhetorical and poetical commonplaces.

The manners of a period so generally degenerate were frivolous and imitative, and the studies of a provincial society, such as that of Gaul, were perhaps especially so. Literary education was confined to a small range of earlier authors. Virgil and Cicero were no doubt the vernacular classics, their ideas and turns of expression were conned by rote, and great portions of their immortal writings committed to memory, but not without injury to independent thought and invention. It was an age of plagiarism both in art and literature. We may discover in a poetaster such as Ausonius considerable familiarity with the mighty ancients, but without the power of reflecting, however faintly, their resplendent genius. At this period, however, commenced the great struggle between the pagan schools and the Christian. The Church set herself to discredit the pagan learning. While many of the greatest of the early Fathers, and at the same time the most earnest defenders of the Faith, such as Origen, Augustine, and the Alexandrian Clement, were eminent for their study of the poets, orators, and philosophers, it is evident that the ancient classics were regarded with general distrust and jealousy. Not only did men of such intellectual power as Tertullian, Arnobius, Lactantius, and latterly Jerome, pronounce decidedly against the study of them; but the sentence of the Church herself was declared in uncompromising language in the so-called Apostolic Constitutions. ‘Refrain,’ said that authoritative document, which speaks at least the language of the third century, ‘from all the wrings of the heathen; for what have you to do with strange discourses, laws or lying prophecies, which turn from the faith the weak in understanding? Will you explore

'history? you have the Books of Kings; for words of wisdom and eloquence you have the Proverbs and the Prophets; for tuneful strains may you not resort to the Psalms?' To the Pentateuch they refer as the legitimate source of law and of natural science or cosmogony. 'Wherefore,' they add emphatically, 'abstain sedulously from all strange and devilish compositions.' The contention of the ancient Church, that all truth was contained within the four corners of the volume of Holy Scriptures, was retaliated by the Emperor Julian, who, not more unreasonably from his point of view, forbade the Christians to lecture and comment upon Homer, whom the bigots of pagan theology regarded as a divinely inspired teacher of religion and morals. The study of the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey' as mere human compositions was just as shocking to him as the study of the Bible in a similar spirit is to many among ourselves. We must not judge him harshly for prohibiting the Christians from thus profaning, as he would have said, in their schools the ancient text-books of all spiritual instruction. They were not forbidden to study Homer under his authorised pagan expounders, but they must not presume themselves to interpret the sacred text to others. How often have similar restrictions upon free thought been imposed, and how near to our own times, when experience, to which Julian was a stranger, has so often proved their futility! It is well to observe, however, that Julian's edict was not altogether approved even by the pagans themselves. Ammianus Marcellinus stigmatises it as 'inclemens, obruendum silentio.' This last of the pagan historians was an honest reasoner, and as a blunt soldier had little sympathy with such refinements. It is certain indeed that the weakness of Julian's character was apparent even to his own pagan contemporaries. The apostate's prominence in history is due far more to the vehement hostility he provoked from the Christians than to the sympathy of the heathen conservatives. Had Julian lived, indeed, his sensitive and irritable temper would not have been long content with the slow and dubious effect of his tentative measures of repression. But his futile career was suddenly arrested, and his policy perished with him. Not so, however, the idea which he had brought so clearly to light of the incompatibility of the new order with the old. The moment was a critical one. Christianity had become recognised in the world as what has been called 'a great fact.' It could not be suppressed, neither could it any longer be ignored. The old and the new faith were, to outward appearance, pretty equally balanced in their power over the human mind, when the question came into debate:

Should the new religion triumph and obliterate the ideas on which the whole social edifice had so long rested, 'all saws of books, all forms, all pressures past'? Or should the two make a compromise one with the other, so that the old superstitions, associated as they were with all ancient art and letters, might still retain their influence over the spiritual life, under the veil of a new ceremonial and a new theological nomenclature, as old friends with new faces?

We have seen, however, that by the leaders at least of Christian sentiments the principle of Julian's prohibition was already in a great degree accepted. Ambrose, the most distinguished preacher of his day in the West, had attained popularity as a rhetorician, formed under the ancient methods, before he was suddenly called to the highest office in the Church; but in his writings as a Christian theologian he asserts his intellectual independence of Pagan models. He betrays little obligation to his Pagan masters in matter or language. In his discussion with the Pagan apologist, Symmachus, we feel at once the contrast between the literary style of the first, so to say, of the modern and the last of the ancient orators. Symmachus retains much of the grace and terseness of the ancient eloquence; but there is a frigidity in his polished and balanced periods, as compared with the rude vigour which animates the stiff and clumsy diction of his self-relying antagonist. If Julian had meant that the Christian youth should become practically excluded from the curriculum of ancient training, Ambrose had, as it were, accepted the challenge, and replied to it by showing how independent the Christian spirit might prove itself to be. From that time the doctors of the Church seem to have become conscious of their true intellectual freedom. They set themselves more and more to depreciate and discourage the ancient culture as unworthy of their own superior enlightenment. Then it was that Jerome, who had freely imbibed and enjoyed the spirit of the ancient culture, constrained himself reluctantly, as he himself confesses, to renounce his Cicero and his Terence, and warn the Christian student against them. Augustine was a well-trained classical scholar, but he also withdrew himself from the fascinations of the ancient learning, and his style no doubt gains in energy and freshness from the depth in which its foundations are laid in the language of sacred writ. The first Christian poet, Prudentius, reflects the tone of the golden or even the silver age of Latinity less than his contemporaries, Ausonius or Claudian, both of whom still cling assiduously to the classical models; but in reading him, rude and inartistic as he is, we

feel that we are in contact with a mind more original and self-relying than belonged to either of the others.

It was not the bold and independent among the leaders of Christian thought who would really have suffered from the imminent divorce between Christian and pagan education. It was the mass of the careless or indifferent in religion who would have been most affected by the threatened exclusion from a classical training, if it had been actually carried out. But the edict was in fact speedily rescinded. The warnings of the doctors were disregarded, and the intelligent youth of the Empire, Christians though they might profess to be, continued generally to resort, as of old, to the schools of the grammarians and rhetoricians, who expounded to them the ideas of the philosophers and the language of the orators and poets. They continued to load their memories with the verses of Homer and Virgil, and the select few who still retained their unquestioned pre-eminence in the crowd of Pagan versifiers. They drank as deeply as ever of the attractive fables of the ancient mythology, notwithstanding its profaneness and immorality. They still admired, even in that frivolous age, the severe and healthy models of the ancient language, and for this they were content to run the risk of much moral and spiritual contamination. The risk, indeed, may have been practically less than it appears. The experience of the many later ages of classical education among ourselves has shown that, as running waters clear themselves of the impurities they carry with them, so the current of the highest ancient literature possesses an innate principle of life and health to counteract whatever evil elements are imbedded in it. The attempt which has been sometimes made by a well-meaning school of thought to teach Prudentius instead of Ovid or Catullus has had little success, and done perhaps no good, while it averted little if any evil.

Thus it was that, despite both Julian's prohibitive edict and the discouragement of the chief Christian teachers, the general education of the Roman people, which was becoming rapidly by profession Christian, continued long to be conducted on the lines laid down by the earlier Pagan schools. Ausonius, of whom we have just spoken, received his education in the middle of the fourth century. He was well born and well bred; he was imbued with the arts and learning of his age; he practised rhetoric and poetry, and obtained high civil distinctions. His compositions betray throughout the thoroughly classical education he had received, his familiarity with the classical models and with the ideas and incidents of Pagan

antiquity. It is clear, indeed, that he accepted Christianity as the prevalent faith of the day. The prayer with which he opens his 'Ephemeris,' or 'Journal,' is really a fine rhetorical summary of the leading doctrines of the Gospel, not unworthy to be compared with the Orphic verses and the hymn of Cleanthes; nor does he fail in one or two other places to signalise the Christian festivals with a reverential emphasis. But how lightly his faith sat upon him appears very plainly elsewhere. To the polemics of the time, which gave tone and impulse to political and social life, he is altogether indifferent. Almost in the heat of the great Trinitarian controversy, he is content with a light allusion to the 'Three Persons' in a poem which dilates on the perpetual recurrence of the number three in pagan mythology, such as the three Fates, the three Graces, the three heads of Cerberus, and many others.

'Ter bibe; tres numerus super omnia; ter Deus unus.'

(*Idyll xi.*)

But in giving his paternal counsel as to the subjects of his son's educational studies, where we might most naturally expect, at a period of religious excitement, a reference to the sources of spiritual knowledge, he confines himself wholly to matters of secular instruction. His 'Protrepticon' or Exhortation (*Idyll iv.*) may have a special interest for us in showing what at the end of the fourth century was the education of a Christian child who was to be prepared to walk in the steps of his father the consul and his grandfather the prefect.

'Read,' it says, 'from beginning to end everything that has been worth recording. I will mention a few volumes only: con your Homer; con your Menander; repeat their verses, aye, mouth them out; the act of recitation engages the attention and kindles feeling. Enable yourself to repeat to me and recall to my memory poems and histories, dramas and lyrics, and make me feel young again in hearing the tuneful strains of Homer, the resounding chant of Virgil, the exquisite idioms of Terence. Read with special attention the histories of the civil wars from Sertorius to Cæsar. Such are to be your studies to fit you for public life. You may depend on my counsel, for I have trained a thousand tender minds from childhood to adolescence, and so it was that the emperor fixed on me to be his own son's tutor, and the young Augustus obeyed me and held me higher than himself, and made me quæstor, prefect, and consul, all which you may become one day likewise.'

So purely Pagan, to all appearance, was the higher education of a Christian child, at a period when, if we confine our regards to the ordinary annals of the times, we might suppose that all human intellect was sternly divided between two

opposite and hostile camps. But in fact it was not so then, nor has it been so since at some of the most nearly analogous crises of religious history.

The attitude of Ausonius, as an educated Christian of his day, may be fitly compared with that of his younger friend Paulinus, who was also a native of Bordeaux, and who had imbibed his Pagan learning in the same schools. His high connexions and ample means enabled Paulinus to take a prominent position at the bar, and subsequently in public affairs. He too was a Christian by profession, but seems to have held little account of his spiritual privileges in his earlier years. It was not till later that he turned his thoughts to religion, and became perhaps the first recorded example of a 'conversion' in the popular sense. His friend and adviser Ausonius was mortified at this change in his views, and at the sacrifice it must involve of his worldly interests. He addressed him just as a modern poetaster, a star in worldly society, might address a promising young man of fashion who has yielded to the persuasions of the Methodists of his day, and abandoned the secular pursuits in which he was just beginning to cut a figure. He rallies him upon the touch of religious melancholy with which his verses now begin to be clouded, the melancholy natural to the tender-hearted Christian, standing so far apart from the strain of gentle sentimental reflection which was the utmost point to which Ausonius had himself attained, and in which indeed he had made some little advance upon the harsher Paganism of the olden time. Paulinus was firm, and finally relinquished the career of secular honours; but he lived to become a popular bishop and saint, and showed himself a really sensible man besides, and he has left us a proof both curious and interesting that a Pagan education was not even in that day incompatible with the development of a truly Christian character.

The schools of Gaul in which Ausonius and Paulinus had received their early training were conducted by the grammarians, who taught the letters and sciences of the time; the rhetoricians, who prepared their pupils for the still bustling career of the bar, the foundation of the fortunes of most of the eminent doctors of the age, such as Ambrose and Augustine; and the philosophers, who continued to expound the doctrines of Plato and other Pagan thinkers to benches thronged with Christian students destined for the sacred ministry, without causing any scandal to a church which in its day of triumph could afford to be liberal. So little effect had the prejudices of Jerome and others had in checking the

general taste for academic training. The profession of learning, however vain and shallow such learning might be, continued to be in fashion through many generations of the declining empire. From the time when Vespasian first recognised the need of popular education, and founded his chairs at Rome and in other great cities, academical institutions had taken root and continued to flourish. Even in the dark days when society was compelled to struggle for the defence of its frontiers, and when it was exposed to ever-recurring revolutions of court and camp, the attention of the government to this system of general instruction seems hardly to have flagged. If the authorities sometimes neglected to pay the professors their salaries, their pupils did not fail to maintain them. It would seem, indeed, that when the barbarians were breaking into the provinces, and threatening to take the conduct of affairs into their own rough hands, the Romans acknowledged the necessity, which has been felt in more recent times, of 'educating their masters.' Nor were the new-comers loth to accept the boon offered them with such nervous haste. While the elder Valentinian issued a decree to protect Rome from the pressure of too great a conflux of students out of all the provinces, Gratian made special regulations for the endowment of professorial chairs throughout the cities of Gaul. While the Goths, the Burgundians, and the Sueves were forging onwards to the Seine, the Loire, and the Rhone, the schools along their banks opened their arms to receive them, schools in which the classics of the Cæsarean empire might be scanned with the aid of the most recent commentators, such as Macrobius and Servius, and of grammarians or philologers such as Donatus, Charisius, and Priscian. A liberal education continued to cherish all the lights of the age after its own fashion; and this education was still perhaps entirely founded upon the ancient models of Pagan literature.

Such was the liberal provision which Gaul continued to make for the education of Christian youth throughout the fourth and fifth centuries. Of all the imperial provinces there was none in which the ancient language of Rome was so generally or so idiomatically used. The influx of the northern tribes, even at full tide, seems to have had little effect in corrupting the literary style of the Gallo-Romans who still formed the bulk of the population. The conquests of Roman language were always even easier made and longer retained than those of the Roman arms. The language of Rome and the culture of Rome both flourished together beyond the Alps, and together with them was linked the profession of the Christian

religion, which found freer scope in that distant province than in the city itself, the focus to the last of expiring Paganism. Gaul abounded throughout this period in Christian writers, both in prose and verse. The prose of the historian Sulpicius Severus, a native of Aquitaine, is a lively though an artificial imitation of classical masters. The verses of Hilarius of Arles, of Avitus of Vienne, of Marius Victor of Marseilles, of Paulinus, and more particularly of Sidonius Apollinaris, and somewhat later of Venantius Fortunatus, however deficient both in taste and vigour, still preserve the traditions of the earlier Latinity. The declamations of the panegyrists, such as Eumenius, Pacatus, and Nazarius, are all strongly tinctured with the old academic spirit, betraying some acquaintance with the ancient models, and showing some facility in handling them. It is curious that these writers were generally Gauls by birth, and some or all of them Aquitanians, a race endued, it would seem, from the first with the rhetorical vivacity which we now call Gasconade, with more power of imagination than of action, and with more fluency of speech than either. 'From the first,' says a clever French writer, 'there were Girondins in the *Gironde*.'

In the cultivation of classical studies at this critical era of change, we trace more particularly the course of learning in Gaul previous to the Carlovingian epoch. The names of Prosper of Aquitaine, Ennodius of Pavia, Avitus of Vienne, Hilary of Arles, Felix of Clermont, Remi, the founder of the Gallican Church, who converted and christened Clovis, all natives of Gaul, and for the most part resident there, may suffice to remind us of literary traditions which continued to linger there, and of the imperial or municipal schools in which they had been so long cherished. 'The decisive and final overthrow,' says Mr. Mullinger, 'of these traditions in Gaul is to be referred to a twofold influence: an influence from without, the Frankish invasion and conquest; and an influence from within, the rise of the monastic schools under the rule put forth by *Cassian*.'

As regards, indeed, the first of these reputed influences, we would refer to the persistence of the classical traditions in Italy, and apparently also in Gaul, to show that the effect of the barbarian conquest upon them was slight or at least indirect. The awe which the Gothic invaders learned to feel for the religion of the South extended for the most part to every branch of its civilisation, and to none more than to its literary culture. As long as classical learning continued to respect itself, so long did it command the respect of Burgundian, Frank, and Goth. But

notwithstanding the few illustrious names which are connected with it in the fifth and sixth centuries, notwithstanding the honour which was still professedly paid to it in certain quarters, such learning had become more and more circumscribed in its scope, and had degenerated, to a great extent, into meagre and revolting trivialities. It is in vain, we think, that Ozanam strives so pertinaciously to rehabilitate it. We can but partially sympathise in what this zealous apologist calls the great effort of ancient philological science to gather up its strength and pull itself together, so to say, in view of the perilous times which were threatening to overwhelm all the culture of the past ages. He refers specially to the book of Martianus Capella, late in the fifth century, which bears the title, ‘*De nuptiis Philologiæ et Mercurii*,’ as indicating the feeling then abroad among the remnant of the lettered classes. This work, more curious than valuable, is written in a mixture of prose and verse, professing to celebrate the marriage of the Pagan god of speech with a nymph whose name, Philology, is invented for the occasion, and who is accordingly represented as a stranger to Olympus. But the oracle of Apollo vouches for her claims to admission, and the celestial gates are opened to receive her. Jupiter, king of the gods, causes the marriage-contract to be read and attested according to the rules of Roman law, and the seven damsels whom the bridegroom offers to his bride for her servants are duly presented. These select maidens are no other than Grammar, Dialectic, Rhetoric, Geometry, Arithmetic, Astronomy, and Music, the seven liberal arts; the same which had been recognised in the educational systems of the civilised world from the time, it is said, of Philo the Jew; the same which were acknowledged in the next century by Cassiodorus, and which continued to form the double course of the Trivium and Quadrivium in the schools of the middle ages.

‘Without dissembling,’ says M. Ozanam, ‘the viciousness of a composition so *bizarre*, one must acknowledge the boldness of thus combining, as regards its form, all the poetry of the past ages, and in its substance all the erudition of his own. This daring inspiration,’ he continues, ‘made the fame of the author and the fortune of his book. The great want of the crisis was to reach the imaginations of the barbarians who were destined to fill in due time the revived schools of learning; it was necessary to satisfy the poetical instincts of these men who had never opened a book, but who passed their winter evenings in hearing the songs of their Scalds. How would they have endured a master who should seek to entangle them all at once in the rough places of conjugation and the crooked paths of syllogism? But when the espousals of a god and a mortal were related to them, they lent a docile ear; and when the poet had devoted two chants to the marvel

of the divine nuptials, they no longer refused to listen to the seven handmaids who undertook to initiate them in the same number of books into the mysteries of all human knowledge.'

This little work, absurd as its conception may seem, supplied, no doubt, a want of the times, and it continued to be a popular text-book for many ages among the northern nations. We are assured that there was a German translation of it as early as the eleventh century.* It was resorted to, we may suppose, not so much as a scientific treatise on the subjects indicated, as for the amount of facts in learning which it noted and preserved. It was the encyclopædia of declining knowledge. Its materials, we are told, are 'ill selected, ill arranged, and ill digested.' The style is inflated, the language semi-barbarous, exaggerating the faults of the worst writers of the worst ages preceding it, unintelligible perhaps to the monks who employed themselves in copying the text which they have hopelessly corrupted. The work, such as it has come down to us, is indeed a monument of the decay of the ancient culture, and a token of the ruin to which it was now hastening.

Another monument of the same kind, and perhaps a still more curious one, is presented in the remains of a writer of the same period, a native of Toulouse, who goes by the pseudonym of Virgilius Maro. We gather from Capella that there was a considerable demand for literary information even at the close of the sixth century; but it is from Virgilius that we may learn something of the kind of information which the teachers had to impart. This author supplies us with a veracious history of the 'grammatic succession.' The first of the stock was Donatus, an old man who dwelt in Troy, who lived a thousand years, who went to Rome, where he was well received by Romulus, and founded a school. There he had a pupil named Virgilius, who wrote seventy volumes on Metric, and instructed another Virgilius of Asia in the mysteries of the Verb. These pupils, it would seem, must have been equally long-lived with their first master, for Virgilius of Asia was personally known to our Virgilius Maro, who acquired the knowledge of many astronomical facts from him. But our Virgil's special master was a certain Æneas, whose lessons he was fortunately able to take down in shorthand; from whom he learned, among other things, that about the time of the Deluge there existed a great personage of the name of Maro, 'in memory of whom,' he says, 'he recommended me to assume the same designation: for in me, he was pleased to

* Ozanam, '*Etudes Germaniques*,' ii. 393.

‘say, the illustrious Maro shall seem to revive.’ If there is any meaning in this wild jumble, it may be conceived that the names here given are symbolical. Toulouse, it is conjectured, stands for the Gaulish Rome, and Rome is of course the second Troy. Romulus may represent Euric, founder of the Visigothic kingdom. The name of Virgil, so often repeated in the fiction, marks the interest which the Christian ages were beginning to feel in the sage, the prophet, the saint, so to say, who had predicted the coming of the Saviour. Thus we find in history a Virgil deacon of Ravenna, another Virgil archbishop of Arles, a third bishop of Salzburg. Our fanciful grammarian mentions by name many of the chief writers of antiquity, such as Homer, Cato, Terence, Varro, Cicero, Horace, and Lucan; but we are not to suppose him to speak, even by rote, of those ancient authors themselves, but rather of various living professors with whom he was personally acquainted, who, after the tasteless fashion of the times, had like himself adopted such illustrious designations.*

The works which we possess of this Virgilius consist of certain epistles on the eight parts of speech, and of epitomes, or brief summaries of grammatical instruction, of a very meagre description. They are curious, however, for the testimony they give to the disintegration of the classical Latin. They abound in strange words, few of which can be traced to any idiom now known, while many genuine words are wantonly disfigured. Nor was this the incidental corruption to which all languages are in course of time naturally liable. The learned men of the day systematically perverted their vernacular tongue by substituting purely arbitrary vocables for those in common use, so as to constitute an esoteric or euphuistic language of their own, known, we may suppose, only to the initiated. This literary idiom might remind us of the

* Among his fragments of classical authors Mai has published the remains of Virgilius Maro, from a codex at Naples and other imperfect sources, and has given in his preface a full account of them. The writer is hardly known to us except from his own strange account of himself. There are, however, some verses of Ennodius about him which seem to show that he was not held in very high estimation by his contemporaries.

‘In tantum prisca defluxit fama Maronis,
 Ut te Virgilium sæcula nostra darent . . .
 Captivo stultus gaudet cognomine vates;
 Non est Virgilius, dicitur esse tamen.
 Cur te Virgilium mentiris, pessime, nostrum?
 Non potes esse Maro, sed potes esse Moro.’

little language of Swift, or the imaginative prattle of children ; something of the same kind as was in use among the fashionables of the English court in the days of Sir Piercy Shafto, or among the French *précieuses* of the Hôtel Rambouillet, but it seems to have been taken more seriously and carried out more methodically.* Thus Virgilius tells us that there are twelve kinds of Latinity, meaning that every common word in the language may be represented by twelve several vocables, according as you would make use of the one kind or the other. These idioms, so to call them, are the Usitata, the Assena, the Semedia, the Metrofia, and so on ; and he proceeds to give instances of their respective application. Upon such nonsense it is impossible to dwell longer, though numerous are the writers who are said to have composed in it, under the most illustrious names of ancient literature, whole volumes on grammar, orthography, and versification, all, we should imagine, equally delirious in style and matter. Thus, as regards their matter, Virgilius relates that he was once engaged, along with thirty of these teachers, in treating on the science they practised. The subject of their discussion was the conjugation of the Latin verb. In the conduct of these deliberations, they soon ranged themselves in two sects, the leaders of which—a Terentius and a Galbungus—had passed, it was said, fourteen days and nights in debating the profound question whether the pronoun *ego* had a vocative case, which was at last determined by the sage Æneas, who affirmed it, but only when the word was used interrogatively. This and similar instances are to be found of the studies in which the learned men of the day delighted. The women followed their example, coming, as usual, to the front of a declining literature, and acquired their meed of fame in due proportion. There was among them a Sulpicia, who may have been deemed a worthy rival of the Roman poetess of that name, and another whose appellation, Fassica, we can trace no further, but which be-

* M. Ozanam says : ‘ Nous serons moins sévères pour ces obscurs ‘ grammairiens du sixième siècle et du septième, si nous songeons aux ‘ jeux d’esprit qui inaugurèrent le règne de Louis XIV., aux Sapphos, ‘ aux Anacréons de l’hôtel de Rambouillet, lorsque Paris s’appelait ‘ Athènes, que Vincennes se nommait Venouse, Meudon Tibur ; lorsque ‘ les précieuses n’avaient plus le parler comme tout le monde, et que ‘ les solitaires de Port-Royal exerçaient encore leurs élèves aux formes ‘ du syllogisme, à l’aide de ces vers que Galbungus aurait signés : —

‘ Barbara celarent Darii ferio Baralip-ton,
Cesare camestres festino Baroco darapti.’

Etudes Germaniques, ii. 447.

came so illustrious that its renown might be expected to endure as long as the world existed.

How far these superficial puerilities extended, or how long they continued in fashion, we have no means of ascertaining. The assumption of fictitious names, as we shall see, was again practised two centuries later. But the witness of Virgilius to the liberality of the Church in preserving the text of some at least of the ancient classics, though confining them to separate shelves or libraries, is of some historical importance. We are still unable to determine any time when the great writings of antiquity were entirely forgotten, even in the darkest ages. The pretence which this writer puts forth, that his secret language was invented to guard the thoughts of the men of letters from the cognisance of their rude barbarian tyrants, can hardly be considered as genuine. At no time did the northern warriors make war upon the ideas of the conquered people; but at the end of the sixth century at least they were very fully in accord with them. They embraced the Roman language and letters with the same simple faith with which they accepted the Roman religion and the Roman jurisprudence. It was not from the camps of the barbarians, but from the schools of the monks, that the heaviest blow was struck against the traditions of the ancient learning. The conventual system was brought, with much modification, from the East, and principally by Cassian, who established places of spiritual retreat in Gaul, of which the most noted was the monastery of Lerins on the coast of Provence. From this corner of Gaul the same system was speedily diffused to Marseilles and Arles, and to Luxeuil and Corbey, till it became the national form of Gaulish monasticism. The followers of Cassian enforced the duty of labour, and enjoined, at the same time, the cultivation of the intellect; but they took a distaste for the classical studies which were still in vogue among the more secular of their contemporaries. The education which they required was confined to the reading of the Scriptures, with just so much of grammar as was necessary for the exposition of the sacred text, so much arithmetic and astronomy as might qualify for calculating the annual recurrence of the holy days, so much music as might assist or direct the voice in plain song. At all events they allowed no superfluous time for idle self-introspection, which had been the bane of the monasteries of the East. The simple copying of manuscripts was a work of practical utility, which might help to imbue the mind with the first elements of general knowledge, to keep alive a sense of the common interests of all Christian people, and to weld Christen-

dom together in the face of the victorious heathen world. Nor was this educational system wholly stationary. The rule of St. Benedict extended the objects it had in view, and made rapid progress from Italy into the West, and especially in Gaul. The monasteries enjoyed much influence, but they could exercise no authority. The rule of the bishops was now rapidly advancing, and it is not unlikely that from an early period these potentates became jealous of the influence of a system over which they possessed little direct control. They began to emulate the superiors of the convents in the education of youth. A school was established in every cathedral under the bishop's direction; and such schools, placed generally in the larger cities, and with the prestige of the chief pastor of the diocese reflected upon them, obtained, perhaps, greater favour with the clergy and people. The instruction they imparted was not more liberal than that of the others; it was directed more particularly to training for the priestly office, and to qualifying the pupils for the performance of the services of the Church.*

'In this manner,' says Mr. Mullinger, 'the great revolution was gradually effected. To the municipal school there succeeded the cathedral school; the *grammaticus* of the former was supplanted by the *scholasticus* of the latter; the Christian preacher occupied the place of the professor of rhetoric: the bishop of the church was at once the head of the diocese, the chief magistrate of the city, the guardian of order, the protector of the defenceless and oppressed. Whatever still survived of moral force, of social influence, of capacity for organisation, when the Frank subjugated Gaul, was to be found sheltering in the monastic cloister, by the episcopal chair, or by the altar of the church. The shrewdness of Clovis discerned the opportunity; the religious zeal of the Latin clergy hailed the prospect of a decisive triumph over their pagan or Arian antagonists. Hence the memorable compact, pregnant with momentous consequences, not only to Frankland, but to all Europe, first ratified when the conqueror bent before the cross uplifted by St. Remy at Rheims—the compact between Teutonic might and the aims and theories of Christian Rome.'

This compact sealed, indeed, the most important revolution that can be effected in the interests of education. It transferred the training of youth from the secular to the clerical power. The education of the ancients had been the province of the State; the schools and, if we may so call them, the universities of the Greek and Roman world had been maintained or subsidised by the State with funds imperial or municipal. The

* M. Ozanam gives a list of more than twenty episcopal schools in various parts of France under the Merovingian kings.

instruction they gave had been wholly and simply secular. But the compact of the Church with Clovis completed the change which had been for some time silently in progress; education became no longer the care of the State; it neither served the State, nor looked to the State for maintenance. It was taken under the charge, first of the monasteries, and next of the cathedrals; from them it received its scope and colour. Its scope, as we have seen, was narrow, and its colour was simply clerical; but it was the clerical career in those days that alone gave room for all the religious and spiritual ideas of which the age was susceptible. The secular education of the past had given way to the religious education, the idea of which has been so generally accepted as the basis of a liberal training even to our own times.

The decline of letters became now more rapid than ever. Gregory of Tours, in the middle of the sixth century, is both a witness to it and an example of its effects. This writer, the Herodotus, as he has been called, of modern history, if he announces the commencement of a new era in literature, attests even more plainly the utter decrepitude of that which was passing away. Between him and Sidonius there was an interval of forty years in time, but in their language, their style, their conception of the art of composition, the difference is immense. The men may be said to have belonged to two different ages of the world.

‘That Gregory’s early training included whatever of classic education still lingered in Southern Gaul will scarcely be called in question. His writings sufficiently prove that he had acquired some familiarity with Latin authors: his Virgilian quotations are numerous; and admitting what is perhaps somewhat questionable proof, he would appear by like evidence to have been acquainted with Sallust, Pliny, and Aulus Gellius. But the fatal influences of his time are clearly reflected in his own style of Latinity; in his candid avowal that he is not solicitous to avoid a solecism; in his deferential appeal to the student of Capella’s compend, as one who might be regarded as learned in the learning of the age; and in his melancholy statement of the motives which led him to compile his history, in which he exclaims, “Alas for our age! for the study of letters has perished from our midst, and the man is no longer to be found who can commit to writing the events of the time.”’

As for himself, the Latin idiom with which he laboured is disfigured by the grossest elementary grammatical errors; while the barbarisms with which it is blistered are often, as he himself confesses, mere wanton extravagances. So generally has the new ecclesiastical teaching driven the secular learning out of the field! Extremes, we know, often meet, of which

fact we may be reminded by the barbarian Chilperic, the son of Clovis, not only composing in this rude age outrageously bad verses himself, but requiring the introduction of new letters into the Latin alphabet; just as the Emperor Claudius had done at the moment when the language had attained its highest pitch of refinement, and the intellect of youth was being forced in schools warmed with endowments. But this prince's freak was mere trifling; it met with no response, nor did it deserve any. The collapse of secular learning became more and more complete. The outward respect which the Merovingian monarchy paid to the Church, to which it had owed the confirmation of its title, though it did not avail to preserve it from gross and rapid spiritual decline, afforded sufficient shelter to its institutions and its fabrics, and some at least of the conventual and cathedral libraries still retained on their shelves a few precious remains of ancient literature, however rarely any individual student cared to profit by them.

In the general confusion of the age which preceded the rise of the Carolingian dynasty, the spirit of bishops and abbots had become thoroughly secularised, and as they estimated themselves so they were treated by the secular power. The pretended reformation of the Church by Charles Martel was mainly a work of confiscation and spoliation. The Christian hero had defended it against the assaults of the Saracens, but it was by making free use of its accumulated treasures. We may imagine, however, that with the loss of so much of their property and of their political influence, the clergy did not fail to recover some of the spirit of their divine institution. The schools of both convents and cathedrals had suffered together in the general eclipse which the Western Church, especially in France, was then undergoing. But the foundation of the monasteries of Fulda, Corbey, and St. Gall on the borders of German heathenism, had already awakened from long torpor the missionary zeal of the early Christians. The missions sought their strength from the subtle organisation of the Roman see, and their leaders constantly repaired to the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul to draw thence courage to support them in the warfare to which their lives were devoted, and in which they were freely sacrificed. These establishments continued for several generations to be the centres of heathen conversion. From them the greater part of Germany received the light of the Gospel, together with the discipline of the Church; but the teachers who went forth from them had taken scant pains to combine secular learning with the simple lessons of the faith, and it was to their vehement preaching, to their

devout zeal, to their ardent spirit of self-sacrifice, that they trusted, not in vain, for awakening the imagination of the admiring barbarians. Charlemagne indeed made use of a third and still simpler method of conversion by the sword; but the zeal of the great Christian conqueror was surely political rather than religious. We may in charity doubt whether the monks themselves approved of it, and still more whether the cause of the Gospel truth was thereby promoted. But the famous emperor, who occupies certainly the first rank, if not, as some ardent admirers would contend, the very first place, among the heroes of secular history, was a man of broad views and liberal sympathies; and if he multiplied the numbers of his subjects by the rude methods of war, he set other instruments to work in promoting their culture, and extending to them the happy influences of a peaceful administration.

Great, very great as Charles himself was, as a warrior, a ruler, and a statesman, his greatness appears all the more eminent from the fact that there is little or nothing in the circumstances of the age to which we can trace its development. Charles was self-made. His views and aspirations were all his own. The dominant idea of his career, the revival of the Roman Empire, was his own conception. The Merovingian kings before him had not dreamt of it. Theodoric, the first barbarian king at Rome, had not ventured to aspire to it. It is not to be inferred indeed from this apathy that Western Europe had consciously abandoned the idea which had so long possessed it, that the universal sovereignty of Rome was an eternal fact, which might lie for a time in abeyance, but could never be definitively lost to the world, or merged in the new order of petty provincial monarchies. The rulers of Gothia, Burgundians, Franks, or Lombards, might stand forth as the actual satraps of the ancient Romania which had retreated into the background, but was not the less still dimly apparent to them in the comprehensive unity of the Roman Church. Charles was the first, since the fall of the city, to give embodiment to this idea by boldly associating the empire with the popedom. From him the world received a dual government; a spiritual sanction was given under his auspices to the temporal power, while a temporal safeguard was conferred upon the spiritual. The wars which he prosecuted almost without remission throughout his long career might be justified in his mind by the religious objects which they subserved. Whether he contended against the Saxons, the Saracens, the Lombards, the Bavarians, or the Avars, he might persuade himself that he was really propagating the true and necessary faith, and pro-

moting the interests of the Church and State together. No such idea had entered into the mind of man before; we may imagine what an impulse it must have given his policy, how truly great it must have made him feel himself. But though so constantly engaged in warlike enterprise, the same idea inspired him to devote his extraordinary energies to the consolidation of empire by legislation. He looked to the future as none of the Cæsars had done before him. The jurisprudence of Charlemagne may be traced almost year by year in the capitularies, or rescripts, which issued from his court or camp, by which the barbarian races which had submitted to his sword were brought under a common law, and launched together on the career of social civilisation. Though the unity of the Frankish empire was soon split up after his decease, its uniformity long remained; nay, in several respects it still essentially subsists. The portions of it which broke off from the Frankland of his successors still retained the impression of his policy. They still maintained themselves against the assaults of barbarian races and of alien religions. The community of sentiment which to this day distinguishes Western Europe from the rest of the world owes its origin most directly to the impress it received from one moulding hand. The functions, and even the titles, of our modern aristocracies are derived from the institutions of Charlemagne, nor less so the parliamentary guarantees of our popular liberties; for he was as assiduous in the holding of councils as in the planning and direction of campaigns.

But we are at present more particularly concerned with the action of the great emperor in regard to education, which bore no less a part than either his wars or his legislation in fashioning the common culture of his own and later ages. The career of Charles as a promoter of education is inseparably connected with that of our countryman Alcuin; but though he met the English scholar as early as the year 768, the first of his reign, when Alcuin passed through Frankland on his return from a mission from York to Rome, it was not till twelve years later that he renewed the acquaintance, and continued the intimacy and sympathy which ever after subsisted between the two. Alcuin had been a student and a teacher at the cathedral school of York, second only to Canterbury, if not actually superior to it. For the influence of Gregory the Great had been thrown heavily into the scale against secular learning, which the Church of Augustine had persistently discouraged, while that of Paulinus in the northern diocese had extended to it apparently more favour. The writings of Bede still exist to attest the substantial purity of the Latin

tongue as cultivated by a northern scholar; and the well-known catalogue of the library at York, signalised in some of Alcuin's verses, shows that the ancient traditions still lingered there, however scanty might be the interest they generally retained for the students of the eighth century.* To York Alcuin returned, and continued to learn and teach there, where he was in high favour with the Archbishop Elbert. Charles was now for some years entirely engrossed with his wars against the Saxons and the Saracens. He had successfully defended the Pope against the Lombards, had conferred upon him the temporal sovereignty of the exarchate, and in return had engaged him to crown his son Pepin as king of Italy. In the course of a first and a second visit to the city,

* This versified catalogue contains the names of the authors specified by the writer, as he says, out of a much larger number:—

‘Quod pater Hieronymus, quod sensit Hilarius, atque
Ambrosius præsul, simul Augustinus, et ipse
Sanctus Athanasius, quod Orosius edit avitus;
Quicquid Gregorius summus docet, et Leo papa;
Basilius quicquid, Fulgentius atque, coruscant;
Cassiodorus item, Chrysostomus atque Joannes;
Quicquid et Althelmus docuit, quid Beda magister,
Quæ Victorinus scripsere, Boethius, atque
Historici veteres, Pompeius, Plinius, ipse
Acer Aristoteles, rhetor quoque Tullius ingens.
Quid quoque Sedulius, vel quid canit ipse Juvenecus,
Alcimus et Clemens, Prosper, Paulinus, Arator,
Quid Fortunatus vel quid Lactantius edunt:
Quod Maro Virgilius, Statius, Lucanus et auctor.
Artis grammaticæ vel quid scripsere magistri;
Quid Probus atque Phocas, Donatus, Priscianusque,
Servius, Euticius, Pompeius, Comminianus.
Invenies alios perplures, lector, ibidem,’ &c.

It will be observed that he notices first the doctors of the Church and other Christian authors, more Latin than Greek. Trogius Pompeius represents civil and Pliny natural history; Aristotle is cited, we may suppose, for his logic, and Cicero for his technical studies in rhetoric; next to these come a goodly array of Christian versifiers, and Lactantius, graceful alike in verse and prose; of the classical poets he cares to mention three only, and all these are Romans, whatever others he may have passed over; lastly, a more numerous list of grammarians and commentators, whose expositions of the poets were perhaps more diligently studied than the text of the poets themselves. Granted, however, that these and other ancient volumes loaded the shelves of the library at York, it is likely that Alcuin, the most ardent student of his day, was one of a very few scholars who really took advantage of them.

which was still the capital of polite letters, Charles's high intellectual powers had acquired a marked direction. He had begun to attach men of learning to his service. His first literary confidant was an eminent Italian, Peter of Pisa. By this man the still more eminent Lombard, Paul the deacon, was recommended to him, and invited to take up his residence in his northern dominions. Whether at Metz or at Thionville, it was probably at the court of the emperor, and in close attendance upon his person, that the cultivated scholar from the south devoted himself to the educational tasks imposed upon him. So far did these tasks extend, that Paul is said to have been employed in teaching Greek to the clergy at Metz; but this may only mean, perhaps, that he assisted them to spell out the sermons or commentaries of the Greek fathers. Nor can we infer from the numerous quotations from the Greek which are found in Alcuin's writings, that that scholar, distinguished as he was, possessed any genuine acquaintance with the language or its literature. He simply borrowed them from the fathers, and especially from Jerome, while his blunders in Greek grammar and orthography betray too plainly how little knowledge he had of his own. The few Hebrew words which appear also in his commentaries may be traced to Jerome.

The first and most authentic account of the life of Charlemagne is that of his contemporary Eginhardt, but this writer concerns himself almost wholly with political and military affairs. The anonymous monk of St. Gall, writing half a century after the emperor's decease, has given us a more interesting account of the great monarch, at least from our present point of view. He commences his work with telling us how, at the moment when Charles began his reign over the West, the study of letters had fallen into the deepest neglect. Then it was that two Irishmen came over by chance into Gaul, men profoundly versed in literature both sacred and profane. Traders they were not, but they went straight into the market-places, crying out, 'Ho! does anyone want knowledge?—let him come to us, and take it, for we have it here on sale.' This they said, because they observed how the many care more for that which they pay for, than for what they get for nothing. So long did they persist in repeating this chant of theirs that it came at last to the ears of the king, who, insatiable in his love of knowledge, sent at once for the strangers, and demanded the price of their wares. All they required was food and raiment for themselves, and minds disposed for learning in those who resorted to them. Charles hastened to attach the strangers to his own person in the palace; but when

he was obliged to go forth campaigning, he put under the care of one of them the children of his nobles and some of the lower classes also. The other he took with him into Italy, and assigned him for his school the convent of St. Augustine at Pavia, and afterwards that of St. Martin at Tours. The one was named Clement, the other was the illustrious Alcuin. On his return, the emperor summoned into his presence the scholars of both classes, the richer and the poorer, and found on examination that the inferior set were far the more advanced in their acquirements. Thereupon, 'with all the wisdom of the 'Supreme Judge,' he set all the poor and learned on his right hand, and made them a complimentary address, promising them, if they persevered in study, wealthy bishoprics and magnificent abbeys. Then, turning with a frown to those on his left hand, 'thundering rather than speaking,' he cried: 'As 'for you, sons of the nobles, delicate and polished youngsters, 'you repose upon your birth and fortune; you have neglected 'my injunctions, and surrendered yourselves to idleness. Let 'others admire you, if they will. I care not for your birth or 'beauty; nothing shall you ever get from King Charles!' After this exordium the monk proceeds to expatiate on the favour the emperor continued to show to learning, giving divers stories in illustration of it, recording various instances of the rewards he bestowed upon indigent but deserving scholars, and of his justice and sagacity in distributing them. In the examination of his scholars he continued to take a warm personal interest. Of the officials who attended upon him in his chapel there was none directed to point out to the reader of the day, by any mark of ink or even of the nail, the place at which he should stop; but everyone had to be on the alert, and catch the signal which the emperor punctually gave him by a guttural grunt or 'ahem!' At that moment the reader must stop, whether prepared or not, whether he judged the sense complete or the contrary. The monarch had, perhaps, an indifferent opinion of his clerks' intelligence; it is possible that he considered himself to be as much *supra grammaticam* as they were *infra*. It is fair, however, to remark that Charles was generally sensible of his own deficiency in scholarlike attainments. His own early education had been slight enough, and amidst the manifold occupations of his maturer years he found it hard to extend or improve it. If he doffed the iron gauntlet to take up the pen and trace his first literary characters, it is no wonder if his efforts were crowned with imperfect success. He was not aiming at caligraphy, as some of his apologists would tell us, but trying to acquire the first ele-

ments of an art which very few laymen, and not all the clergy, of his day had acquired. But whatever might be the extent of Charles's personal attainments in learning, his aspirations for himself, and still more for his people, deserve our warm acknowledgments. The royal duty of educating his people became more and more impressed upon him with every visit he paid to Rome, with every contact he made with the still lingering traditions of the old imperial civilisation. In the year 787 he addressed an encyclic letter to his bishops and abbots, in which he insists upon the study of letters as only next in importance to the practice of a holy life, urging that the true Christian must please God in his words and speech as in his deeds; 'by his words he shall be justified, and by his words he shall be condemned;' that if errors in language are dangerous, much more so are errors in sense and understanding; that the language of the Holy Scriptures especially requires for its just appreciation a thorough knowledge of the rules of rhetoric and logic. He would have instruction in these fundamental sciences extended to all classes and all ages. He ordains that schools be opened for the training even of children, and that not only the children of serfs, but those of free men, be invited or required to attend them. Splendid were the visions that rose before him of the doctors and fathers whom one generation of the youth of his empire might thus supply. 'Would to God,' he once said to Alcuin, 'that I had twelve such doctors in Frankland as the holy Jerome and the holy Augustine!' 'Be content, sire,' replied his patient monitor; 'the Lord of heaven and earth himself has but two such.'

It was in the year 781, when Charles was in Italy, that he met with Alcuin the second time. The English scholar had come from York, where the fame of his teaching, supported as he had been by the Archbishop Elbert, had attracted students from distant parts, and was now returning with the pallium from Pope Adrian for Elbert's successor, Eanbald. The emperor was soon convinced that he had found the right man to promote the educational work of Peter of Pisa and Paul the deacon, of whom the former was worn out with age, the latter had chosen to quit his service, and had retired to the monastery of Monte Cassino, to write the history of his own countrymen, the Lombards. To the Englishman the Frank was nearly akin, and Northumbria had formed political ties with the Frankish empire. The admiration of Charles and Alcuin was mutual. Alcuin was easily persuaded to exchange his office as *scholasticus* or professor at York for the direction of the school which Charles attached to his own

court. He parted from his archbishop on friendly terms, leaving the cathedral school in good hands, and took up his residence under the emperor's wing at Aachen. Both the monarch and the teacher were in the flower of their age, and full of generous sympathy with each other. Charles was distinguished by the favour with which he treated the foreigners whom he attracted to his court for the promotion of his educational projects. He kept many of them about him in the short intervals snatched from his military enterprises, and made their maintenance a charge upon his revenues during his frequent absences. The example may have been set by his father Pepin, but it was by Charles that the School of the Palace was developed into a regular institution. He looked upon the restoration of letters as the means of consolidating the rude forces of the empire which he was acquiring by arms, and he assembled at his court the noble youths whom he destined for office in Church and State, to try their abilities and train their understandings. The students who met in the palace at Aachen were required to look beyond the art of chanting and calculating Easter, or even of conning the lectionaries of the Church services. For the conduct of public affairs it was expedient that they should learn both to talk and write Latin as well as their vernacular German tongue, and Charles attempted, though it would seem unsuccessfully, to establish schools on the eastern borders of his empire for instruction in Greek, with a view to intercourse with the court of Constantinople. The regular education of the youth of the Palace School was derived indeed from the manuals of the grammarians; and Alcuin, whom we are not allowed to credit with any original views, might have been content, as we may judge from his own meagre summaries of the learning of his day, to abide within the lines traced out by a Gregory and an Augustine. It was by the personal influence of the liberal emperor himself that the Palace School was widened to embrace an ampler range of study, and to look beyond the ecclesiastical traditions of the cathedral and the monastery.

‘When, however,’ to quote Mr. Mullinger again, ‘the circle was joined by Charles and the older members of his court, the instruction necessarily assumed a different form. The adult mind can rarely master knowledge after the fashion of more tender years. That wondrous faculty of the youthful intellect which causes it to resemble a capacious carpet-bag in the way in which it receives and retains whatever the instructor may think fit to put into it, disappears as the judgment becomes matured. The memory then refuses to burden itself with facts of which it apprehends neither the importance nor the connexion; and so

we find Charles and his courtiers plying the *vates* from across the Channel with innumerable questions, often blundering strangely and misapprehending widely, but forming a circle which even at this lapse of time it is impossible to contemplate without interest; the monarch himself, in the ardour of a long unsatisfied curiosity, propounding queries on all imaginable topics—suggesting, distinguishing, disputing, objecting—a colossal figure gazing fixedly upon his admired guest, and altogether a presence which might well have disconcerted a less assured intellect. Alcuin, however, holding fast by his Boethius, Cassiodorus, and Isidorus, is calm and self-possessed, feeling assured that so long as he only teaches what “Gregorius summus” and “Bæda venerabilis” believed and taught, he cannot go very far wrong. Around him, as the years went by, he saw successively appear the three royal sons born in wedlock, Charles . . . Pepin . . . and Lewis There, again, was Charles’s much-loved sister Gisela. . . . Thither also came the last and best-loved of his wives. Liutgarda . . . his son-in-law Angilbert . . . the royal cousins Adelhard and Wala. . . . There, too, were Riculfus, Eginhard, Fredegis’—

the bishop, the biographer, the poet and philosopher. We have spoken before of the strange affectation of a famous alias, so common among the *literati* of an earlier period. The custom still continued or was revived under the eye of Alcuin himself. This scholar and instructor of scholars thus addresses his illustrious pupils in the numerous letters he has left us: Charles under the name of David, Pepin as Julius, Gisela as Lucia, Liutgarda as Ava (Eve); Adelhard becomes Antony; Wala, Arsenius; Eginhard, Beseleel, and so on. He had himself assumed the pseudonym at one time of Publius, at another of Flaccus. Such trivialities might be well suited to the narrow sphere of Alcuin’s acute intellect. But if the great hero, patient and scrupulous as he was in all things, and shrinking from no amount or waste of labour in the extension of his knowledge and his intellectual interests, condescended to them, he had the genius to conceive much higher uses for their attainments than his teacher could open to him. We cannot but imagine that it was a relief to him when his teacher became at last weary of his own position, constrained as he was to follow his pupil from Aachen to Metz and Thionville and Worms, and elsewhere, as war or policy required, feeling perhaps that he had nothing more to teach him, and that his spirit was rebuked by the grander spirit with whom he was so closely connected. It was about the close of the eighth century, when this connexion had subsisted nearly twenty years, that Charles graciously conferred upon him the Abbey of St. Martin at Tours, one of his most important and conspicuous ecclesiastical posts, and encouraged him to devote his remaining energies to the maintenance of a model monastic academy.

The site of the city of Tours might seem to have been destined for the capital of the great country which lies behind the natural boundaries of the Alps and the Rhine and the Pyrenees. Its communication with the sea is direct and rapid. The broad basin of the Loire and its tributaries is eminently fruitful. These streams indeed are capricious, and the Loire itself, overwhelming in its volume in spring and autumn, is again in summer drought not always navigable. But its quiet and luxurious abodes are too far removed from the military positions on the eastern frontier to which the eye of the warlike chief of a warlike people must ever be directed. The royal palaces in the Loire valley, at Blois, Amboise, Chinon, Chambord, and Tours, have furnished the kings of France with pleasant retreats; but it has been at Paris, at Soissons, or even in Charlemagne's time as far east as Metz or Aachen, that their government has been permanently fixed. Tours was at this period no centre of political and civil rule, but it was the highest seat of ecclesiastical influence in the Frankish empire. The abbey was the wealthiest of its class, the cathedral the most splendid, and the renown of the saint who was patron both of the one and of the other made them above all others the resort of devout visitors. St. Martin was glorified as the founder of monasticism in Gaul rather than even his master Cassian. Neither St. Denys nor St. Remi had as yet displaced him in the reverence of the Frankish people. The Merovingian princes had placed themselves under his special protection; the Carlovingians continued to send their richest offerings to his abbey; and the kings of France at a still later date were proud to assume the title and wear the vestments of its superior. Already the landed possessions of this abbey extended over whole provinces, but its ecclesiastical influence was still more extensive. Tours had become the metropolis of the Frankish Church.

Fresh from the restraints of the royal residence the new abbot might well rejoice in the career of dignified usefulness which lay before him. Education had been his employment through early and middle life, and he found himself still free to make it the congenial occupation of his few declining years. He opened at once a school for general instruction, and rejoiced to find that his name was an attraction which drew numerous students. After so many years passed on the Continent he still reverted to the library at York as the most abundant storehouse of the choicest learning, and he solicited the emperor's leave to send some of his younger monks to England, with a commission to bring to St. Martin's the books, or probably

copies of the books, which he deemed the most valuable: 'To bring back,' as he phrased it, 'to France the flowers of Britain, so that these may diffuse their fragrance, and display their colours at Tours as well as at York;' adding in the same strain: 'In the morning of my life I sowed in Britain, and now in the evening of the same, when my blood begins to chill, I cease not to sow in France, earnestly praying that, by God's blessing, the seed may spring up in both lands.' But Alcuin, it would seem, still looked backwards rather than forwards. His mind reverted to the studies of his own youth, but it did not enter into his views to extend them with the expansion of human thoughts and interests in the train of receding barbarism and advancing culture. His ideas of education had received no development along with the progress of civil and religious society. On the contrary, we cannot but remark in his correspondence a feeling of regret at the time he had wasted in early years on mere secular acquirements. Virgil, once his delight, he now regards as an idle fabulist. He enjoins his pupils at Tours to be content with the sacred poets, the versifiers of Genesis and the Gospels. He rebukes one of his favourite and most accomplished scholars for being more familiar with the twelve books of the 'Æneid' than with the four volumes of the Holy Evangelists. He ventures even to reprove his 'dearest David,' when Charles recurs to him for the solution of some literary questions, savouring, as he says, of the learning of the old School of the Palace which he has now exchanged for the true wisdom of the Church and the Scriptures. He may indeed have disguised, in his communications to the imperial patron of more liberal arts, the restrictions he actually put on the studies of the monastery. 'In compliance,' he says, 'with the royal pleasure, I shall give to some 'the honey of the sacred writings, shall gladden others with the vintage of the ancient learning, and mete out to a few the apples of grammatical subtlety;' but an incident related by his biographer throws some suspicion on these pretended relaxations. Sigulfus, we are told, along with two others of the younger brethren, endeavoured to carry on the private study of their favourite Virgil. The abbot detected their irregularity, and sternly rebuked it as contrary to his express injunctions. Sigulfus was confounded, and, throwing himself at his superior's feet, solemnly promised to do so no more. After a severe reprimand, the good abbot took him again into favour, and both he and another of his accomplices obtained high praise in later days for their application to sacred studies. But, however narrow were the educational views of the abbot of St. Martin's,

the zeal and industry with which he enforced them, and maintained the moral discipline which is the best foundation of all learning, were amply rewarded. They were rewarded by the confluence of students from divers quarters, and from his own beloved England among them, the copious library of York proving less attractive to many Northumbrian scholars than the fame of the most accomplished of tutors. The school of St. Martin's monastery sent forth a succession of teachers formed on Alcuin's model, who set up educational institutions of the same kind throughout France and Germany. Sigulfus and Adalbert perpetuated their master's system at Ferrières. Samuel, bishop of Worms, and Haimon, bishop of Halberstadt, both his pupils, cultivated theology in the schools of their cathedrals. Rabanus Maurus, the most learned and the most famous of all, made the abbey of Fulda illustrious as a nursery of theologians; and his disciples—Walafrid Strabo, Otfrid, Ruthardt, and Ermenric—carried on the tradition of monastic teaching which they had derived originally from Alcuin at Tours. The descent of this learning may be carried much further down with some increase of development, and sanguine writers have deduced from it, through Lupus Servatus, Rémi of Auxerre, Odon of Cluny, Drogon, Roscelin, and Abelard, the birth of the University of Paris.

With the learned of his day, most of them his own pupils, at Fulda, Corbey, York, and Tours, Alcuin maintained a large correspondence; but among his letters many are addressed to the princes and princesses of the court at Aachen, full of exhortations to peace and amity, and his communications with Charles himself on the duties of rulers and the liberties of the Church were frank and outspoken. Nor did he suffer thereby in his generous patron's favour. Charles had ever held the city of Tours in high esteem on account of its illustrious saint. For the sake of his friend the abbot, he took it into still greater favour. He confirmed to it the riches it had accumulated through the liberality of former devotees, and gave it a charter of exemption from taxes, 'for the salvation of his own soul ' and the increase of his kingdom.' He continued to multiply its possessions till a population of twenty thousand slaves or serfs, and not less than sixty thousand dependents of all kinds, were gathered round the abbey in a territory as large as a modern department. But the lands of St. Martin were not confined to this locality. They extended in a long line from Tours to Aachen itself; so that the abbot might, if he chose, rest every night, on his journeys from the monastery to the royal residence, within domains of his own. His course would

lead him along the bank of the Loire to Ferrières-en-Gatinais, thence to Troyes, to Nogent-sur-Marne, to Choisy-sur-Aisne, to Corbey and St. Servais, in all which places were abbeys dependent on their mother church at Tours. On the approach of death, he was allowed to assign these various monasteries to his most cherished pupils, which done, he resigned his own position as their common superior, and died, as he had ever wished, on the feast of Pentecost, in the year 804.

We may draw our remarks on the schools of Charlemagne to a close, with another quotation from our author's lively sketch :—

‘Europe’s lofty beacon (*Europæ celsa Pharos*), as Alcuin on one occasion styles Charles, continued to shine over Frankland for ten years after Alcuin himself was no more. Neither family bereavement nor the declining fortunes of the empire appear to have diminished the ardour with which the aged emperor still pressed on internal reform, discussed knotty questions in theology, or pursued his literary researches. He gave to the Western Church the grand strains of the *Veni Creator*; his autocratic decision (a trait which reminds us somewhat uncomfortably of the Merovingian Chilperic I.) inserted in her symbolum, in defiance of Leo III., the fatal *filioque*; while, if we may credit Theganus, the last days of his life found him correcting (probably by the aid of Clement of Ireland’s superior Greek scholarship) the Vulgate translation of the Gospels.’

It was thus that the foundations of revived education were laid in the eighth century at the critical epoch of the foundation of the revived Roman Empire. The chief point to which we would direct our readers’ attention is, that this foundation was first laid in the teaching of religion, and was placed mainly in the hands of the priestly orders. Charles himself was not insensible to the value of education for the service of the secular government, and gave his warm encouragement and even his personal attention to the means by which it might be advanced and extended. The School of the Palace was essentially a revival of the imperial education instituted by the Cæsars of old. We forbear to enter upon the period when both these institutions flourished side by side under Louis the Pious, Charles’s son and successor; when they reached for a brief period to a development of brilliant promise; when, on the one hand, the professional training of the clergy was more fully and more widely enforced, and, on the other, the claims of a higher philosophy were recognised together with a more liberal appreciation of the old classical models. But these hopeful days were too soon overclouded. The empire of Charlemagne broke up in utter confusion. Wars and revolutions unsettled

men's minds and diverted them from all thought of spiritual or intellectual occupation. The incursions of the Northmen followed, and the destruction of the once honoured abbey of Tours was but one of a series of similar disasters. Three or four centuries were yet to elapse before the foundations of education could be again cleared for the superstructure which has since been reared upon them, for the theological seminaries of our mediæval cathedrals, for the disputations in our early universities, for the endowment of our colleges and hostels, for the grammar schools under control of the bishop or the abbot; again, for our free schools specially exempted from it; and lastly, for the model towards which we seem to be now impatiently tending, when the clerical element shall perhaps be excluded from the direction of popular education.

ART. V.—1. *The Racehorse in Training, with Hints on Racing and Racing Reforms.* By WILLIAM DAY. London: 1880.

2. *History of the British Turf, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day.* By JAMES RICE, Barrister-at-Law. In two volumes. London: 1879.

3. *The Racing Calendar for the Year 1879: Races Past.* By C. J. E. and J. P. WEATHERBY. Vol. 107. London: 1879.

4. *Ruff's Guide to the Turf.* Winter Edition, 1879–80. London: 1879.

THE Turf has had the misfortune of late to attract in a more than ordinary degree the attention of Parliament and the press. The Jockey Club too, by which the racing world is chiefly governed, is criticised with unsparing severity, and various faults incidental to a sport which has developed from a simple and enjoyable pastime into a gigantic system of gambling are attributed to the Club's want of firmness and promptitude, although, it must be confessed, not always logically or with good reason. Within the last eight years an Act has been passed for the repression of certain phases of turf gambling, and for the licensing (which will probably end in the suppression) of race meetings in certain localities; nor is it unlikely that Parliament may be compelled, or at least urged, to take speedy action with a view to putting down, wholly or partially, the enormous system of 'speculation' which, during the last fifty years, and more particularly during the last

twenty years, has been engrafted on the pastime of horse-racing. All real friends of the turf, men who race only for pleasure as well as those who are desirous of improving our breeds of horses, are agreed in opinion that racing is now largely overdone. In many places the meetings of recent years have unfortunately become a nuisance of a very aggravated kind, the easy access afforded by our numerous railways having facilitated the movements of bands of insolent roughs who disturb the neighbourhood and interfere with the course of sport. Even the repose of Newmarket has recently been broken by persons intent on robbery or other crimes, who intensify the bad repute in which racing is held by a large number of excellent people.

That racing, largely fed by the gambling element, to which it is on all sides exposed, is increasing to an uncalled-for extent, becomes apparent from the turf statistics of 1879, although these are not in some respects so heavy as those of some preceding years, several of the more abject gate meetings having been abandoned. It appears, however, that from February to November inclusive, a meeting held in January being also taken into account, there were held 271 race meetings of all kinds. The number of stakes raced for was 2,920, and the meetings occupied in all 478 days of racing. The horses contending for the various prizes numbered 17,446, the same animal, however, taking part in many of the contests. In the two kinds of racing, flat racing and steeplechasing, probably 2,500 different horses would run; one horse ran thirty times in the course of the season, and many of the competitors on from five to sixteen occasions. The value of the stakes raced for in 1879, including cups and plates, was not far short of half a million sterling, the largest amount paid at any meeting being at Ascot, where the stakes in money reached the handsome sum of 26,617*l*. The most valuable race of the year was the Derby, which exceeded by a trifling amount the sum of 7,000*l*., consisting of the money paid by the namers or owners of the horses.

In the matter of the larger stakes the racing of 1879 gave to sixteen noblemen and gentlemen the chief profits, the total sum of their winnings being 166,463*l*., or about a third part of the half-million sterling which has been mentioned. The largest amount won by any one of these gentlemen—the result of twenty-nine races—was 26,366*l*., the lowest amount being 5,092*l*. No winning account of less than 5,000*l*. is included in the above computation, although there were probably three hundred winners of sums varying from five thousand to fifty

pounds. As regards the highest of the above amounts, it has been exceeded, we may state, in some previous years; the largest winner in 1877-78, the same nobleman in both years, pocketing 34,378*l.* and 37,378*l.* respectively, whilst the value of the stakes won by him in 1879 was 23,528*l.*, and in the five years from 1875 to 1879 his total earnings amounted to 126,799*l.* These sums represent the greater prizes of the turf. In thirty-five races in 1879 the stakes were over 1,000*l.*, in eleven the sums gained were over 2,000*l.*, and in three races over 6,000*l.** The blanks of racing are numerous indeed. In the annual tables of statistics presented to readers of the sporting journals, sums are named as won by owners of race-horses, which would not pay the fees of the jockeys who rode them, coupled with the travelling expenses of the animals engaged; whilst it is probable that many good sportsmen only tried their fortune to draw blanks.

In the volume of the 'Calendar of Racing for 1879,' issued by Messrs. Weatherby, who represent the business department of the Jockey Club, various additional statistics are brought together. The Calendar deals, however, only with races run on what is called the *flat*, steeplechasing records being dealt with separately. The number of horses engaged in flat racing only in 1879 was 2,113, each of which, as has been already stated, ran one or more times; the value of the stakes is represented at 380,699*l.*, being less than the amount previously given, which includes stakes for steeplechasing. It can also be ascertained from the Calendar that the produce of 2,995 brood mares in 1879 added 1,855 youngsters to the racing stock of the country. The number of races run on the flat during the last five years has been as follows:—In 1875, 1,909; 1876, 1,907; 1877, 1,639; 1878, 1,699; 1879, 1,626; showing a considerable decrease since 1875.†

These figures show the magnitude to which the pastime of horse-racing has at present attained, although the amount paid down in stakes, large as it is, does not convey a correct idea of the expenditure incurred in racing, or the very large amounts of money which are annually betted against the chances of particular horses winning any given event, estimated, as will pre-

* These statistics are derived from the 'Sportsman' and the 'Sporting Chronicle' newspapers.

† In 1849 the number of horses that ran on the flat was 1,315, and in 1859 the number had increased to 1,645; so far back as 1822 the horses competing numbered 988. In the year 1863 the number of races brought off on the flat was 1,668, and in 1864 only 1,514.

sently be seen, at the prodigious sum of 5,000,000*l*. Only a very small percentage of the two hundred thousand persons who annually visit Epsom to view the struggle for the Derby, or who see the races run at Ascot or Goodwood, have even a rudimentary idea of what is required to be done before the actual work of racing can begin. The spectators of a horse-race—we speak of the majority—go simply for the sake of enjoying a holiday, and care for nothing but what they see, having no desire to penetrate behind the scenes. A race, however important and exciting it may prove, is quickly over, and, in most cases, at once forgotten, except by those having a pecuniary interest in the result. The ordinary spectator of a horse-race, such as the Derby or Royal Hunt Cup, is like a child taken to a theatre. The gorgeously appointed and glittering pantomime, for aught the child knows, may have fallen from the clouds ready prepared; the happy little one, wonder-stricken at what is before him, knows nothing of the toil which its preparation has caused, or of the condition of the hundred people who have for weeks been engaged in preparing the spectacle. Much after the same fashion the business of the turf, which culminates at stated intervals in a Derby or St. Leger, or in the running of some great handicap, is very onerous, as all in the secrets of a training establishment can tell. None but those familiar with the business of the turf can possibly know the terrible anxieties which beset a popular trainer of race-horses, especially when the patrons of the stable are addicted to heavy betting, and, as the phrase goes, ‘stand to win a ‘fortune’ on a particular horse. To keep the animal in good health demands the trainer’s unceasing attention; to see that its food and drink are properly supplied and of the best quality, that its gallops are carefully regulated, that it is warmly housed, and that no improper person obtains access to the stable, are duties which must be performed with unvarying regularity and unceasing watchfulness. Though a trainer be ever so lynx-eyed and vigilant, he will sometimes be baffled, and may awake some morning near the day of the race to find all his hopes frustrated by a villainous conspiracy. A Derby favourite has before now, despite the care of the trainer, been rendered *hors de combat* by being ‘got at’ in the stable, no one at the time being able to tell how; its water may have been poisoned, its food adulterated, the blacksmith may have pricked it in shoeing, its stable attendant may have been bribed to administer some noxious substance to the animal, or it may fall into a trap dug for it on its training ground. A few hundred pounds paid for the exercise of a little villainy offers a

wonderful incentive to the inventive power of a professional or other turf conspirator.

Only one horse can, of course, win the Derby in any one year—and for that race it must be nominated when it is a yearling—but the same animal may also gain for its owner two or three of the other great races, the stakes of which represent a little fortune of twelve or fourteen thousand pounds. It is quite possible for the same horse to win the Two Thousand Guineas, the Derby, and St. Leger; indeed, that feat has been accomplished more than once, and, not to speak of the value which would attach to the horse able to do so much, the united stakes usually represent a large amount of money. In 1879, these stakes represented respectively sums of 6,250*l.*, 7,025*l.*, and 6,525*l.*, or a total of 19,800*l.* The chance of winning amounts like these is doubtless the reason why such high prices have of late years been paid for yearlings. Were a horse, costing as a yearling, say, five or six hundred pounds, to prove successful in winning any two of the great races, its owner, if so disposed, would perhaps be able to sell it for a matter of 10,000*l.*, with the view of running it for cups and then using it at the stud. Curiously enough, however, although men are found, year after year, to give large prices for yearlings, comparatively few of these expensive purchases ever win an important race. In the year 1876, eighteen yearlings brought a total of 26,950 guineas; in 1877, twenty-one of the yearlings sold realised 30,720 guineas, and in the year following 20,800 guineas was realised by fifteen animals. In 1879 the following sums were realised by the seven yearlings which brought the highest prices—2,200, 1,500, 1,400, 1,300, 1,000, 1,000, and 1,000 guineas respectively—while fourteen others were sold at sums of 500 guineas and upwards*

* The average prices obtained for yearlings during the last year or two have not been large, so that one or two of the public breeding studs, despite the big sums given upon occasion for particular horses, notably Maximilian and Blue Blood, for which 4,100 and 3,000 guineas were paid, and a few others for the sums we have named above, have ceased to carry on business. In five sales which took place from 1866 to 1868, the following average prices were realised by yearlings bred at Middle Park—445*l.*, 324*l.*, 446*l.*, 360*l.*, and 295*l.* respectively. At the sale of the royal yearlings at Hampton Court in 1879, the twenty-six yearlings disposed of realised about 142*l.* each; the lots of other breeders, however, realised better averages in the course of the season. The royal yearlings, when disposed of in the year 1837, yielded for colt foals 1,471 guineas, and for filly foals 1,109 guineas, there being thirteen of the former and eighteen of the latter, so that the average was considerably below one hundred guineas.

—the sires most favoured in the prices brought by their stock being ‘Doncaster,’ whose produce averaged 536 guineas; the produce of ‘Wild Oats’ 487 guineas per head, of ‘Cremorne’ 453 guineas, of ‘Hermit’ 455 guineas, ‘Queen’s Messenger’ 443 guineas. The stock of other sires also realised fair averages. It would doubtless prove interesting to follow the fortunes of these animals, and to note how few of them recoup their purchase-money, coupled with the cost of their keep, as well as their travelling and other expenses. A fashionably bred yearling, costing, say, a thousand guineas, will not be trained, travelled, and jockeyed, for a less sum than about 300*l.* per annum. Can it be wondered at, under such circumstances, that nearly all sportsmen require to gamble in order to pay the heavy bills of their trainers and the accounts of their jockeys? In one fashionable stable two owners have sixty-eight horses in training, many of which are heavily entered for future stakes of every description; and if the patrons of the stable have to disburse a sum of 20,000*l.* per annum in training expenses, they will be getting off for a moderate amount. There is, however, a *per contra* in this case, as the two gentlemen alluded to won in the course of 1879 the handsome amount of 30,000*l.*, and may therefore have profited to the extent of 10,000*l.* sterling by their racing transactions; what they may have won or lost in betting is, of course, their own business. The gambling incidental to the turf will be considered before concluding our remarks.

The business of racing includes, of course, the breaking in and training of the horses. On the skill with which this is accomplished depends much of the success of the animals during the racing season. Some racing men incline to the belief that the best horses are those which are privately bred by their owners, and that, in consequence, the days of large breeding studs for the purposes of public sale are numbered; but there are still about a dozen speculative breeding studs in England, kept up at considerable expense, and introducing to the turf every year a large number of highly bred horses, the greater number of which are sold by auction. A yearling racehorse, at the time of its purchase, may look the picture of health, be exceedingly ‘blood-like,’ and possess all the characteristics of a valuable animal, but before it has been three months in training it may be found utterly useless for racing purposes; so that investing a sum of money in blood stock for the turf is very much like buying a lottery ticket. The horse which some years ago was bought as a yearling for 4,100 guineas has probably not yet earned in stakes much more than

the interest of the money paid for it. Some trainers are particularly fortunate with yearlings entrusted to their care, and are able, as a rule, to bring them, as soon as they are fit to race, to the various meetings at which they have engagements, trained to perfection. Others again, less able in the conduct of their business, or perhaps not so fortunate in the speed or stamina of the animals entrusted to them, do not make so good a show with their horses, and consequently are not looked upon with the same favour by the racing community. It is never difficult to win a race with a good horse, if it be properly prepared for the struggle and be well 'placed;' but many capable judges of horseflesh think that horses are occasionally what may be called 'over-trained,' and that, in consequence, when the hour of contest arrives, they are compelled to succumb to some more robust rival. Many trainers have acquired fame in their business from ability to train a horse to win the Derby or St. Leger; others devote their time and attention to the preparation of horses for short races or great handicaps, whilst a third class keep to steeplechasing. It forms no part of our intention to describe at present the economy of a training stable, but enough has been said to indicate that the office of the trainer is not a bed of roses. The rising trainer of the period is a man of some education and intelligence, a contrast in many respects to his predecessor of fifty years ago, who was usually a groom and nothing more; the trainer of to-day knows something of the anatomy of the horses under his care, and is familiar with them in health and disease. He requires also to attend to their commissariat, and generally to administer his establishment, which may be large; he is probably the master of thirty or forty lads whom it is difficult to keep in order, and at the same time, if his is a public training stable, he may have the hard task of reconciling the interests of half a dozen exacting masters, all desirous that their horses should quickly make their mark in the annals of the turf. One or two trainers also keep racehorses on their own account, which is to be regretted; gentlemen who pay some hundreds or perhaps thousands a year in training expenses do not like to be beaten by their trainer's horse, despite the fact that all may be square and aboveboard.

These observations are amply confirmed by an able publication from the pen of Mr. William Day. In his recent work, 'The Racehorse in Training,' will be found the results of experience gathered during a period of thirty years spent in the management of a great training establishment. Of all men, Mr. Day is entitled to speak with authority on ques-

tions of racing, as he may be said to have been born, as he certainly was bred, to the business. During his early youth he was a trusted and much-employed horseman, at a time when it is now affirmed that 'the silks and satins of the 'turf' were worn by giants—at any rate, by jockeys who are now looked back to as having been at the very front of their calling. Those who desire to know what a practical man has to say for and about the business of his life—that business being the preparation of horses for the purposes of racing—cannot do better than peruse Mr. Day's volume, which has been published at an opportune time, and is replete with trustworthy information on all the vexed questions incidental to modern horse-racing, conveyed in good style, without the use of the slang terms which most writers on sporting subjects seem to think necessary. A full half of Mr. Day's book is devoted to the consideration of the best modes of preparing horses for the racecourse, excellent advice being offered as to the purchase of 'yearlings,' the construction of stables, as well as the best modes of feeding, grooming, and exercising the high-mettled and high-priced horses which compete for the prizes of the turf; the remainder of the work is devoted to the exposure of abuses and the advocacy of certain reforms.

Trainers of racehorses are in general, notwithstanding the numerous insinuations which are frequently made against them, men of fair integrity of character. No doubt they sometimes make mistakes in their judgment of horses as regards powers of endurance and speed; and many critics who write in a hostile spirit fail to remember that a trainer is, after all, but a servant, not always allowed by the owners of the horses he trains to exercise his own judgment. Both owners and trainers may have at times a fortune in their grasp without knowing it. Horses, upon which at first very little store has been set, sometimes prove of great value, able to win important stakes, and afterwards bring large sums of money for use at the stud. To be in a position to inform his employer how best to 'place' his horses, so that they may win, constitutes one of the chief merits of a trainer. It is not, for instance, wise to enter a slow plodding horse to take part in a short-distance race, where speed is the chief requisite; nor, on the other hand, is it of any use entering a horse, suitable for a brilliant dash along a five-furlong course, in such races as the 'Goodwood Stakes' or the 'Cesarewitch' handicaps, which can only be won by animals of great staying powers—in other words, by horses possessed of rare stamina. Some owners and trainers of racehorses have such a happy knack of 'placing'

them that they win half the races for which they are entered. A gentleman possessing a stud of only half a dozen racehorses will often have a larger winning account at the end of the year than an owner of perhaps four times the number, because he knows better what to do with them, so that, by winning a few races, they may at least pay for their keep, if they do not earn a profit.

Men possessing big studs strive to win the larger stakes; but as these are fewer in number and attract more competitors than smaller races, the chances of success are proportionately lessened. But when a 'City and Suburban' or 'Cesarewitch' is won, the money earned even in stakes is well worth adding to the owner's bank account. A few followers of racing lay themselves out to win cups or similar trophies, which are competed for on every principal racecourse; they would rather see their sideboard ornamented with a handsome cup than win a great handicap. Other racing men, again, care nothing for cups; it is money, and money only, they want; the horse to them is a mere instrument of gambling. As may be gathered from the statistics already given, there is a very large number of horses either engaged in racing or being prepared for the turf; it would probably not be an exaggeration to say that, of all kinds and ages, there are not less than ten thousand thoroughbred animals, some of which are of great value as stallions and brood mares. In 1879 fifteen such horses were sold for 24,370 guineas, or an average of something like 1,625*l.* each; and if the ten thousand horses of every kind, estimated as being used or being prepared for racing purposes, were to be valued at 200*l.* per animal—which is not by any means an extravagant price—the blood stock of the country would represent a sum of two millions sterling. Trainers entrusted with the care of such valuable property require to be men not only of intelligence, but of strict integrity.

The jockey of the period is nowadays an important factor in every race, and quite a 'personage' besides, especially the successful and consequently the fashionable jockey. Of late years the chief 'mannikin' is said to have earned the income of a bishop. For the winning of an important race his employer may perhaps present his jockey with a thousand pounds sterling, whilst a legion of admirers and followers will lavish upon him presents of the most varied and wonderful kind. It has been calculated—and the calculation, there is reason to believe, is a moderate one—that a jockey in good employment will receive from persons 'backing his mounts,' in voluntary offerings, double the amount of his fees. A year

or two since a comparatively unknown jockey received anonymously a sum of 500*l.* for obtaining an unexpected victory in a certain race which it was thought would not be won by the horse he rode. There are jockeys and jockeys, and a good horse, it may be said, will, for the moment at any rate, convert a mediocre horseman into a famous rider, and one well-run race may procure for him a steady flow of business. There are, however, 'boys' who, like the present chief jockey, rapidly develop a natural talent for the art of riding, and whose services on the occasion of an important race are eagerly competed for, whilst the frequency with which these lads bear off the honours of the turf testifies to their ability. The leading jockey of the period has won over a thousand races within the last five years. There are not on the turf at present more than a dozen persons who can be designated as first-rate jockeys, but the one alluded to stands out from his fellows as a master of his art.

The nominal fee of a jockey, as fixed by 'the rules of racing,' is five guineas for riding a winning horse and three guineas for riding a horse which proves unsuccessful. To the ordinary run of jockeys the fees named are usually all that are paid on ordinary occasions, but for riding in important handicaps horses which have been backed in the betting ring to win large sums of money special bargains are made, so that any jockey with a little ability has the power of earning quite as good an income as the colonel of a regiment of dragoons. A jockey of repute, who is brought down special to a country meeting, will have as large a retainer as a popular counsel in an important case, besides being probably 'put on' to win in a bet or two a large sum, if the horse he rides proves successful. Upon a late occasion, when a Newmarket jockey was brought down special to the North of England, his fee is said to have been fixed at one hundred pounds in addition to his travelling and living expenses, whilst he was 'put on' to win a couple of hundred if he won the race, which he did. Several of the more able jockeys are retained at considerable salaries to ride only for certain stables when such stables have a competing horse. Some jockeys serve more than one master, each master paying a good wage in addition to fees and special allowances. We have no means of knowing the exact number of jockeys—the names of those who have taken out licenses not being yet published—but in 1879 upwards of 120 different 'boys' figured in the flat races of the season, their mounts ranging from 1 to 568; the twelve leaders in the business of horse-riding had in all 3,589 mounts.

As illustrative of the wages of jockeyship, it may be stated that the chief jockey must have earned in 1879, at the nominal fees already named, the handsome amount of 2,000 guineas; in his case the income named is really 'nominal,' if presents flow in at the rate which has been already indicated, and retaining salaries are as large as they are reputed to be. The jockey who was so fortunate as to win the Derby was presented—so it was rumoured at the time—with a cheque for 1,000*l.* by the owner of the horse, and the presentation of large honorariums to a successful jockey is now by no means uncommon. The nominal fees of the twelve leading jockeys of 1879 would amount to over 12,000*l.*, or at the rate of a thousand pounds for each of them, and, at a very moderate computation, their fixed allowances, perquisites, and presents would run the amount up to 35,000*l.*, of which the share of the leading jockey would probably be over 6,000*l.* Jockeys are now licensed. It has been found necessary to license them because of the misconduct of some of their number in keeping racehorses and making heavy bets. These lads are very liable to be seduced from their allegiance to their employers, to be corrupted in fact by the offer of large sums of money to betray the secrets of the stables in which they are employed, or to take means to ensure that a given race shall be lost by them instead of being won. In consequence of their being exposed to such temptations jockeys are lavishly rewarded; if a betting man knows he will have to pay 20,000*l.* or 30,000*l.* if a given horse wins a particular race, what signifies the expenditure of a few hundreds to ensure that the race shall be lost, and that he will not have to pay? It simply comes in the end to a game of brag between certain evil influences and the employer of the jockey. When a man wins 50,000*l.* in bets over a popular handicap or other race, he gives his jockey 1,000*l.* or 500*l.*, but the jockey may have refused as big a sum offered him to 'pull' his horse, and so lose the race. Happily, there are not a few thoroughly honest horsemen on the turf at the present time, men whose integrity is beyond dispute. Unthinking, volatile lads are sometimes, however, spoiled by success, and go to 'the bad,' as it is called, from being so much flattered and treated. In minor turf circles the minor jockey is just as much a god as the fashionable horseman is in higher grades of social life. The times are changed since the period when a jockey was simply a livery servant, and thought a present of a guinea from a satisfied master was a matter of great moment.

Mr. Day condemns the system of giving lavish presents to jockeys; he maintains that whatever power a jockey may

possess, or however brilliantly he may exercise it, so long as he receives the regulation fee, he is well and fairly paid for his services. 'I should have little faith,' says the astute trainer, 'in the honesty of a jockey whose moral rectitude' stood on such slippery ground 'as the expectation of gratuitous, and in 'reality unearned, money.' As an illustration of how the old school of racing men dealt with the riders of their horses, he says:—

'What would the jockeys of to-day think of a present offered them like the following, and for similar services? After winning the Two Thousand, the One Thousand, and the Newmarket Stakes for the Duke of Grafton, the jockey was requested to attend at the lodging of Lord G. Fitzroy (the Duke's brother), who wished to make him a present. His lordship, after descanting on the jockey's virtues as a man, and his ability as a jockey, finished a diatribe of about half an hour's duration, by taking from his writing-desk a purse, and saying, "In the "Duke's name and for him, I present you with two new five-pound notes "on the bank at Bury St. Edmunds, and beg you will take care of "them." This was rather a different method of appreciating or rewarding talent than is customary now, and yet they had honest jockeys, and good ones too, in those days.'

The business of horse-racing is brought to a focus at a particular place on a date determined upon. At that place the officers whose duty it is to carry out the business are all in attendance. Different race meetings are differently constituted. The meeting at Goodwood, for instance, is held by the permission of the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, on the property of that nobleman; the royal meeting at Ascot is carried out under the auspices of the Master of the Queen's Buckhounds. Other race meetings are promoted by joint-stock companies, such as those held at Manchester, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and elsewhere, many of which are very profitable to the shareholders. The races which are run at Newmarket take place by authority of the Jockey Club. The business of racing is regulated at most of the meetings by an official who is known as 'clerk 'of the course.' He is a person of great importance, and may perhaps be the lessee of the course, grand stand, and all other appurtenances requisite for carrying on the meeting. On whatever footing any individual of the class may carry on business, the clerk of the course, speaking generally, is the mainspring of the whole adventure. It is the interest of this official, from whatever source his remuneration may be derived, to crowd his programme with as many races as it is possible to get through, and to hold meetings as often as possible and on as many days as sport can be provided. The clerk of the course is usually aided by a 'clerk of the scales,' on whom

devolves the important duty of weighing out and weighing in the jockeys, before and after a race is run, and seeing that each carries the exact weight, neither more nor less, apportioned by the handicapper. This person must keep his eyes open while engaged in the performance of his duties; otherwise he may become the victim of a tricky jockey or owner, who has some object to gain by perpetrating a fraud—it has more than once occurred that the scales have been tampered with. At some meetings the judge himself officiates at the scales, and takes care that the weights are respected. At small meetings the judge, in theatrical parlance, ‘doubles’ many parts, acting both as handicapper, or adjuster of weights, and clerk of the scales as well. The handicapper is a most important personage at all race meetings, it being his duty to adjudicate the weights to be carried by the horses entered in the different handicaps and other races. The success of all race meetings is largely dependent on the knowledge and ability of the person engaged as handicapper, because owners and trainers are very jealous and exacting, as well as quite able to detect at once and resent, by the withdrawal of their horses from any given handicap, any instance of favouritism. No handicap is thought to be successful unless more than half of the horses entered are permitted to accept the weights conferred upon them; sometimes, however, although a handicap may be remarkably well constructed, and every horse have a fair weight attached to its chance, the acceptances, for various reasons, may be exceedingly small. It has been suggested in turf circles, in order to ensure equality in adjusting the weights for all the more important handicaps, that a public handicapper ought to be appointed by the Jockey Club, and perhaps this will some day be done. In a handicap the weights are adjusted to the supposed capacity of the competitors, a wide range being sometimes taken by the handicapper—5 stone 7 lb. being the lowest weight apportioned to any horse, the highest weight being perhaps as much as 9 stone 4 lb.

The starter is another important racing functionary; without such a personage no meeting, indeed, could be held. It is his business to start the horses which are to compete in the race. The duty of the starter, more particularly when there is a large field of young horses (two-year-olds), is very difficult to perform satisfactorily, especially in cases where the race falls to be run over a short distance. Starters require to be men of firmness and decision of character, as they may have at times more than thirty jockeys under their command, each eager to secure some advantage at the start; some of these lads are

mounted on unruly animals, while others of them goad their horses into fury for the sake of delaying the start, until the jockey of the expected winner is beaten by cold and fatigue even before the race is run. The starter has necessarily a great deal in his power, and instances are known of such officials having favoured a particular horse by allowing it to obtain what is called a 'flying start,' or some other advantage; as, for instance, a start effected when a number of the jockeys might be unprepared for the signal.

The starter officiates at one end of the course, the judge at the other. The judge ought to be a person of rare integrity, and, so far as can be known, the present racing judges are men of respectability in their calling. Not only the integrity of the judge, but his powers of observation, are of the utmost importance; from his fiat there is no appeal, his judgments are final and irrevocable, and on some of them there may be hundreds of thousands of pounds at stake; the winning of large amounts of money may only be accomplished by a couple of inches—a nose; in the slang of the turf a horse is sometimes said to win or lose a race by 'the skin of its teeth.' It occasionally happens that a race is so nearly what is known as a dead heat, that persons express themselves dissatisfied with the verdict of the judge, and assert that the second horse won the victory. Again, a race is often so close that the leading jockeys are themselves ignorant which horse has won till the number of the winner is hoisted on the indication board. When a large number of horses start for a short race, half a dozen of them will sometimes run so evenly and be so close together, that it is very difficult indeed for the judge to say which animal arrived first at the winning post. A novice in the judge's box during an important race would be a misfortune for all concerned, because, even in the case of a very obvious blunder, the official may insist on his verdict being correct, for, as has been stated, there is no appeal from it.

Besides these important officials there is a little army of money and check takers, doorkeepers and clearers of the course, dressed in uniform at some of the meetings. The Cerberus who watches at the entrance gate of what is called Tattersall's Ring is an old *habitué* of race meetings, and is supposed to know by head mark every person who comes into the paddock, and especially those who have the right of entrance to the sacred enclosure devoted to the members of Tattersall's, which is reserved for the *crème de la crème* of the turf world, no payment being able to secure admittance for any but the 'right sort' of people.

Any exposition of the business of horse-racing which did not contain a few words regarding the 'tout' would certainly be incomplete. The 'tout,' as known to the racing world, is a person who makes it his business to collect and disseminate information about the various horses in training. One tout may have several masters, each paying him in some shape for his work, one or two in hard cash weekly, others by giving him a smaller or larger sum of money when they back a winning horse from the information which he supplies. Clever horse-watchers earn a good deal of money, so many gamblers being anxious for speedy information as to the condition and prospects of important horses. At almost every training-ground in England there are touts, and very little can take place with regard to the stud of horses in training which these persons do not themselves witness or hear of. An early telegram of a trial won, or of the breakdown in a trial or at exercise of a particular horse, is of great importance to a turf gambler, as the money market is so sensitive that the odds laid against a horse change with great rapidity whenever there is a rumour for or against its chance. The tout is up with the sun to witness the morning gallops of the horses; from a considerable distance perhaps, but armed with a powerful glass, he sees all that takes place, and before breakfast will have despatched half a dozen telegrams to intimate that all is well with the favourite, or that the second favourite has pulled up lame, as the case may be. It is doubtless difficult enough, on a training ground where fifty or sixty horses may be at work, to determine for what particular race certain animals may be in training, but the tout is equal to the occasion, and some of them are able to name the winner of an important race while yet a large price may be obtained against its chance in the betting market.

An enormous revenue is derived from the stands, paddocks, and rings at a popular centre of racing. Every inch of ground is turned to account in some way or other, either for stands, paddocks, waiting-rooms, lavatories, or refreshment bars. At some meetings the charge for entrance is very heavy, and the cost of private boxes and other conveniences exorbitant—the result being, of course, a plethoric income to all more immediately concerned in the venture. As has been stated, certain race meetings are now under the control of companies organised for the purpose; as an example, Epsom racecourse, on which the Derby is run, is leased from the proprietors of the ground by the Grand Stand Company, which derives a handsome return from the fees of all kinds charged for admission

to the grand stand and its appurtenances, as well as for portions of the ground let for stands and booths, and from a toll exacted from the numerous vehicles which bring companies to witness the great race. Yet the men who run their horses in the Derby Stakes have themselves to provide the funds by which the winner is rewarded, probably as much as 6,000*l.*, the owner of each of the competing horses paying 50*l.* for the entry. Horses entered for the race, but which do not start, pay half that amount. The running of the Derby is probably the means of putting into the pockets of the company or companies, if there are more than one, a sum equal to the prize earned by the winning horse. The great race meetings held at Manchester are conducted on what is called the 'gate-money' system, a certain sum by way of poll-tax being exacted from every person entering the race-ground, whilst other and higher charges are made for access to various stands and enclosures. The authorities of the Manchester race meetings, unlike the authorities at Epsom, are very liberal in giving large amounts of added money to certain races; to one race alone they add a sum of 2,000*l.*, and they are about to inaugurate a new contest, to which they will add 1,000*l.* It has been computed that at Manchester on some of the race days, fixed for the Whitsun holidays, as many as 80,000 persons have paid for admission to the race-grounds sums varying from sixpence to a guinea.

Different race meetings have their varied characteristics. The Derby day, for instance, is, even in the busy metropolis of London, observed as a holiday. To witness the race for the Derby is a perennial ambition of large masses of the population. Even the House of Commons adjourned for many years to witness what Lord Palmerston called our 'Isthmian games.' A highly salaried clerk in a great London warehouse resigned his situation because he was not allowed to go to the Derby. The meeting at Epsom is not a fashionable meeting, in the sense of being patronised by the best society. It is to Ascot and Goodwood the ladies of the British aristocracy look forward as pleasant places of reunion previous to the close of the London season. At Newmarket, again, racing has always presented itself in a more business aspect. Racing there has never been looked upon as a show; in fact, it is evidently with reluctance that various concessions have lately been made to the public by erecting a new stand and re-arranging the refreshment department of these meetings. A day or two before the commencement of a race meeting the horses which are to compete begin to arrive in the neighbour-

hood. In the early morning hours the various trainers are to be seen trotting and galloping their long strings of horses on the racecourse, giving them what students of the sport call a 'pipe-opener.' A regiment of touts will be found in attendance, taking notes of the morning gallops; racing reporters will also be present—the one to telegraph his opinion of the chances of the different horses to his employer, who probably bets on the information thus received; the other to write an account of what he witnesses for the newspaper on which he is employed. It is wonderful how large a number of persons turn out at an early hour to witness the morning performances of the horses. Owners and trainers are there, of course, as well as many of those motley hangers-on who haunt the different racecourses.

Newmarket is the capital of turfdom; in England it is known as 'head-quarters,' and is the nominal seat of the turf parliament, represented by the Jockey Club. There are thirty-one different racecourses on Newmarket heath, ranging from a little over a furlong to the Beacon Course of four miles, while in the course of the year seven meetings take place, at which more than 200 races are annually decided. In 1879 the number of races run at Newmarket was 236. Newmarket, as well as being the head-quarters of the turf so far as the sport of racing is concerned, is also the chief resort of the trainers and likewise of the touts, many of the principal racing stables being at that place. The Jockey Club being an eminently private and conservative body, none but the stewards and chief members know anything of its financial position, except the fact that it is supposed to be wealthy. A portion of the revenue of the club is derived from what is called 'the heath tax,' which yields four guineas annually for every horse trained at Newmarket, and there will probably be altogether about a thousand of these animals in training at that place. One guinea is also exacted from the owners of every horse trained elsewhere which comes to compete in races run at Newmarket. A tax of two guineas is likewise levied for such yearling horses as are broken in on the heath, while there are other sources of revenue, such as a charge for vehicles coming on the heath and the overplus obtained for horses sold out of selling races, which it is unnecessary to particularise.

The Jockey Club is an association of kings, princes, peers, and esquires. Exclusive of members of the Royal Family, the membership embraces no less than forty-four peers. It is on conditions laid down by this body that the business of horse-racing is chiefly carried on. The Jockey Club administers the

'rules of racing,' which it also makes and alters from time to time. The powers of the Jockey Club as exercised by the stewards—who are, for the time being, the executive of the body—are exceedingly despotic. Without their sanction racing cannot anywhere be carried on, because, unless a race meeting be advertised as under the sanction of the Jockey Club—or at least under the rules laid down by that institution—all trainers, jockeys, or horses taking part in it would be disqualified from competing at Newmarket or any other race-ground where the rules of the club are recognised and acted upon. All offences against the laws of racing and the practices of the turf, written or traditional, are taken cognisance of by the Jockey Club, and the stewards of that body form the tribunal before which they are adjudicated. The 'rules of racing,' as passed by the Jockey Club, are carefully devised: they appear to provide for every possible contingency that may arise in the course of racing. The management of races, as well as the powers of the stewards at all race meetings, are duly defined; the periods of the year during which racing may go on (that is, flat racing) are fixed, corrupt practices are condemned, the fees to be paid to jockeys are specified, and the mode of a jockey's engagement pointed out. As to the entering of horses for selling races there are ample details, whilst the rules as to objections and dead heats are plainly laid down.

Some of the matters, however, on which the Jockey Club have framed regulations, are not always successfully dealt with, despotic as are the powers of the body. One of the high crimes and misdemeanours of the turf is 'watching a trial,' but the trials of racehorses previous to an important race, somehow or other, always become public—even in the face of the stringent rule which lays down that if any person be found watching a trial, or be proved, to the satisfaction of the Jockey Club, to have employed any person to watch a trial, or to have obtained surreptitiously information respecting a trial from any person or persons engaged in it, or in the service of the owner or trainer of the horses tried, 'every person so offending shall be warned off Newmarket Heath, and other places where these rules are in force.' The consequences of being warned off Newmarket Heath are fatal to the offender as a racing man or votary of the turf, for, so long as his disqualification continues, 'he shall not be qualified to subscribe for, or to enter or run any horse for any race, either in his own name or in that of any other person.' Another clause deals with any person who may corruptly give or offer any money, share in a bet, or other benefit to any

person having official duties in relation to any race, or to any jockey, and metes out to such offender the same punishment, as also to any of the officials or jockeys accepting such money.

There are numerous other stringent rules and regulations, designed to prevent or punish fraud in connexion with racing; but these it is scarcely necessary to recite here, as these examples are sufficient to show the powers possessed by the Jockey Club in all matters pertaining to the turf. The club takes no cognisance of disputed bets, nor does it in any way recognise betting; but there is no doubt that some of the rules of racing have been made in favour of betting. Of what consequence would it be that the result of a trial should be known, were it not that it would prevent the owner of a horse from obtaining the best price if his horse won the trial, or hedging his money to advantage if it lost? If there were no betting, it would not be necessary to bribe a jockey or any other official in order to obtain information. If owners of racehorses never betted at all, but simply ran against each other for the stakes of the different races, there would be no need for many of the clauses in the rules of racing which the Jockey Club has devised. Few men, it has been said, are able to maintain a stud of horses without the aid of their betting book—not that they are always successful in winning their bets, but they obtain a chance of winning a large amount, and that kind of speculation fascinates the majority of the owners of racehorses.

There are very few outside the range of racing circles who have any knowledge of the enormous sums of money which every year change hands in the betting ring or at Tattersall's and the numerous turf clubs throughout the country. Most people have heard or read in the newspapers stories about betting on the Derby, or about the getting up of Derby 'sweeps,' and that kind of gambling. Of sweepstakes on the Derby there will probably not be less than two or three thousand drawn before the day of the race in London, the sums subscribed varying from a shilling to a guinea—a few even of larger sums—and the total amounts will in some instances reach a thousand pounds. Abroad, in India, California, Canada, Australia, and other countries, there are also Derby sweeps, for which thousands of pounds are subscribed. But there are other races on which there is a still greater amount of gambling; and when it is taken into consideration that in the period from February to November there is racing for four hundred and seventy-eight days—several meetings, that is to say, taking place on the same day—and that, in round

numbers, 3,000 races are run in the course of the season, it will be at once apparent that there is no lack of opportunity for what, in some quarters, is called 'speculation.' No means exist by which the figures of turf gambling can be ascertained with any approach to perfect accuracy, but guesses of the extent to which the 'speculation' is carried on have been frequently hazarded. It has, for instance, been stated that a million sterling will change hands every year on the racecourse alone on half a dozen of the classic races, including the Two Thousand Guineas, Derby Stakes, the Oaks, and the St. Leger. The sum named, we should say, is probably within the mark, although nowadays long prices cannot be obtained against the favourites or most likely horses to win these races, because of their qualities being previously ascertained in other contests, seeing that most of them have been at work as 'two-year-olds.' At Doncaster, where the St. Leger is annually decided, there were four days of racing during last September, on which—exclusive of the great race—thirty-two contests took place, the number of runners being 218, or, with the St. Leger horses, 235. Probably some who peruse these remarks may think it an exaggeration, but it may be set down that as much as half a million sterling would be the amount to which bets were made in the St. Leger week on the racecourse at Doncaster. At the Doncaster meeting it is calculated that there are from four to six hundred bookmakers, big and little, hard at work within the rings during the four days; and it is well known that very heavy betting takes place on the Champagne Stakes, the Great Yorkshire Handicap, and the Portland Plate. The more extensive bookmakers will enter bets to the amount of a few thousands in their books in a couple of minutes, and the crowd of smaller men will be booking the odds to two, five, ten, and twenty-five pounds as hard as they can write the names and figures; whilst an army of small bookmakers outside the ring will be sacking crowns and half-sovereigns with wonderful industry. At the same time, betting on all the races run at Doncaster, great and small, will be going on over the country, especially in London, Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, and Edinburgh, for considerable amounts; and all the year round the game continues with more or less intensity.

Taking it for granted that 1,500*l.* only is risked by betters on each of the small races run during the season, and that there are, say, 2,600 such races, the total sum risked will amount to nearly four millions sterling. To that sum must be added the money which is risked on the larger races. On

some of the popular betting handicaps, such as that run at Lincoln at the opening of the season, the Grand National Steeplechase at Liverpool, the City and Suburban at Epsom, the Royal Hunt Cup at Ascot, the Northumberland Plate, the Stewards' Cup at Goodwood, the Ascot and Goodwood Stakes, the Liverpool Cup, and the Cesarewitch and Cambridgeshire run at Newmarket, quite a million sterling will be represented. To say that a sum of five millions is annually risked in the turf market for the purposes of betting seems like wishing to play on the credulity of the public, but there are good reasons for believing that the amount is probably understated. It must be kept in mind, in trying to arrive at a fair estimate, that betting is going on all over Great Britain every day, and in such races as the Cesarewitch and Cambridgeshire as much as from thirty to a hundred thousand pounds has gone into the hands of the owner of the winning horse. When three years ago (1876) the horse 'Rosebery' won, it was matter of common report that his owner had gained, by bets alone, a hundred thousand pounds. To say that the horse was backed by the general public to win half as much more is well within the truth; and 'Rosebery,' although the winner, was not the only horse that was heavily backed for the race. 'Woodlands,' the first favourite, which came in second, and 'Hopbloom,' were also largely supported. Twenty-nine horses ran for the Cesarewitch in 1876, and all of them would be backed to win at some kind of price. The price of the favourite, 'Woodlands,' at the start for the race was at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 1; in other words, to win a sum of 45*l.* by the success of that particular horse, the better required to risk a sum of 10*l.*, which, of course, as the favourite was beaten by 'Rosebery,' he would lose. The betting against 'Rosebery' (the winner) was at the rate of 100*l.* to 14*l.* Large sums of money are daily remitted to English betting men now resident in Boulogne, who bet on all the great handicaps and classic races. There are at least four English betting men in the French seaport, all doing a good business by correspondence, one or two of them, perhaps, making a book to lose 10,000*l.* on some of the big handicaps. As a general rule, the bookmakers have in the end by far the best of the bargain; for although fifty horses may be backed for a handicap or other race, only one can be successful, and the money for which all the others are backed is, of course, won by the persons who laid the odds—of whom there are over two thousand now at work, some betting to half-sovereigns only, others laying the odds to hundreds of pounds.

We have purposely dwelt at length upon the incidence of betting because 'betting is the curse of horse-racing,' an evil which continues day by day to grow with what it feeds on. Had it not been that men could bet on the races, the kind of meetings which some three or four years ago took place in the vicinity of London would never have been heard of. They were simply traps baited for persons who had money to spare for gambling purposes. We do not say that all meetings which took place were of the same character, but many of the races run at these suburban saturnalia of rogues and roughs were utter shams; it being a foregone conclusion that some altogether unexpected horse should win, thus allowing a certain class of persons, who were privy to the arrangements, to bag good sums of money. If we are not mistaken, the Jockey Club, by raising the value of the stakes to be run for in certain races, did good work, both to the turf and to the community, in putting down some of the more abject of these gate-money gatherings.

The reason why there is such a vast amount of gambling in connexion with the turf is not far to seek. The followers of horse-racing have engaged in a pursuit they are not able to follow without assistance—that is to say, it does not pay to race as a business, probably not above twenty persons being able in the course of a season to clear their liabilities by means of their winnings. If there be, as we have calculated, ten thousand horses, of all ages, available or in preparation for racing, hurdle-jumping, and steeplechasing (including sires and dams at the stud), it is obvious enough that the mere interest on the capital sum invested on their purchase must amount to a large sum of money; at five per cent. on two millions sterling it would amount to 100,000*l.*, and the bare keep of these ten thousand horses, as represented in their housing, food, and grooming, cannot be set down at a less sum over head than 60*l.* per annum, which represents 600,000*l.* All these horses are not, of course, engaged in racing, but we have seen from the statistics already given that probably as many as 2,500 competed in the flat races and steeplechases of 1879. The expenses of entering, travelling, and jockeying these animals for the various races in which they contend may fairly be estimated as being about two hundred and fifty pounds over head, which amounts to 625,000*l.* or a total of 1,225,000*l.*, for which a series of races are provided, the stakes of which amount to about 500,000*l.*, and the larger portion of which sum is subscribed by the owners of the horses which run for the contests in question. The keeping of a stud of racehorses is a

much more expensive matter than persons who are not familiar with the affairs of the turf will credit. The gentlemen who in the course of 1879 won only a few hundred pounds in stakes, if they owned more than a couple of horses, would be losers, unless they were able to balance accounts by means of their bets, except, of course, in those instances—not uncommon on the turf—where men run horses to lose instead of win. It is a most dishonourable practice, but there are persons who are not averse to ‘milking’ their horses, as it is termed, or rather to ‘milking’ the public by means of some of the animals they enter for the different races.

There are now hundreds of race-going bookmakers for the tens there were thirty or forty years ago. Large numbers of petty tradesmen, taking advantage of the facilities given by the railways, leave their business for a time, and ‘make a book’ at some of the race meetings. The bookmaker, if he is prudent, sober, and industrious, is almost sure, in the course of ten years, to earn as much as will make him an independent man for life. It is, of course, the gamblers who give such men their fortunes. The chief bookmaker of the period—a man who will bet, if occasion offers, in literal tens of thousands—is reputed to be worth one hundred and fifty thousand pounds in saved money. It may safely be affirmed that not ten men in a hundred, of all the backers of horses who find their way to the turf, can maintain themselves or make a little money at the game; yet thousands upon thousands annually try their luck. They have no chance, however, against the professional better, the man who lays the odds; ninety out of every hundred of the combatants are simply contributors to his exchequer. Of late years much has been both said and written against the system of betting in ready money, and it is, we believe, ‘illegal,’ in some way, to table the stake beforehand. We cannot bring ourselves to approve of gambling in any shape, either on the turf or anywhere else, believing that society would in every way be better if there were no such modes of speculation; but we cannot see the logic of preventing betting for ready money, and, by inference, encouraging betting on credit. If the one system is bad, the other is worse. When betting originated, both betters deposited their stake in the hands of a third party, who paid the united amount to the winner. Betting is now a business of such vast magnitude that such a simple mode of procedure cannot be now adopted. Would that it could! If a man were compelled to deposit his stake every time he made a bet, he would be more cautious in betting. ‘Put me down

'the odds to a monkey!' (500*l.*) is easy to say, but it is not so easy to pay, and, were it to pay at the moment, the chances are that no 'monkey' would be put down. It requires no argument of ours to prove that betting and gambling of all kinds are detrimental to the moral wellbeing of a nation, and ought to be suppressed with a high hand wherever and whenever it is possible; but legislation which forbids money to be betted in ready-money crowns, and encourages it in sovereigns betted on credit, is a way of using the power of the law which is certainly not logical.

Reverting, in conclusion, to the powers of the Jockey Club, we have no hesitation in saying that the members do not rise to their position. The institution undoubtedly possesses the power of so regulating horse-racing as largely to abate this nuisance of gambling, which is now eating into the turf like a cancer. Why, for instance, are the entries and weights for handicaps which cannot be run till the months of April or May published in January and February? Simply to admit of gambling? The members of the Jockey Club cannot directly interfere in such matters, but surely in this respect they can set their own house in order, and then insist upon the houses of other people being also cleansed. It may be said without fear of contradiction that the Cesarewitch and Cambridgeshire are the two greatest gambling races of the year. They are run at Newmarket under the auspices of the Jockey Club, the names of the horses entered to contend in these races are in the hands of the public shortly after Midsummer, by the time the St. Leger is set to be run the weights are published and the acceptances known, but these races are not run till the middle and end of October. By such an arrangement the Jockey Club ministers to the gambling which is the chief feature of modern horse-racing. Here is a matter, it will be at once seen, for which the club could with a breath provide a remedy. Is there any reason but that we have indicated, why the entries and weights and acceptances for any handicap should take more than a fortnight to arrange?

There is another much-needed reform which is obviously well within the powers of the Jockey Club, and which indeed must be near at hand, namely, the discontinuance or abolition of 'the child jockey' in handicaps. The kind of race indicated, 'the handicap,' admits, as has been already explained, of the running together of horses of all ages and of both sexes, and to enable the animals to compete on terms of equality they are handicapped, i.e. weighted, according to their supposed *form*. So that all horses are treated on terms of equality, any scale

of weights might be adopted, and therefore it may be asked, 'Why should it be necessary to end the scale of weight in a handicap at 5st. 7lbs.? Is there any reason for such an absurd weight being awarded to a horse that has reached its third year?' We think not, and we are not singular in our opinion that the lowest award in any handicap should not be less than seven stone. Mr. Day, we are glad to see, is on our side, and he backs up his opinion by quoting that of the late Mr. John Scott, the celebrated trainer of Malton. Mr. Day remarks:—

'As I have previously demonstrated by examples, children cannot manage the horses they ride, and they are driven all over the course, and often out of it, and galloped twice the necessary distance before the race. Indeed, I fearlessly assert, that if there is one mistake greater than another, it is the adherence to the present ridiculous system of assigning such low weights to horses of all ages in handicaps. Nothing craves a more speedy remedy, and that remedy, to be effectual, should be the addition, not of a few, but many pounds. . . . The late Mr. John Scott strongly advocated that the weights should be raised; and no one was likely to know better than a person with his vast experience, or to give a more candid opinion. If the recognised standard for two-year-olds is 8st. 10lbs., and if early in the spring they can and do carry this weight (which in handicaps is sometimes increased to 9st. 12lbs.), why cannot all of them carry it in the following year? A 7st. minimum would put the good three-year-olds over two miles and a quarter in the autumn at 9st. 10lbs., and the old horses at 11st.—a difference of 2st. 10lbs. between the best and the worst of the three-year-olds, and of four stone between the highest and lowest of all ages—a difference much the same as that now existing. I think that few will disagree with me in the conclusion that a horse that cannot win with such weights is not good enough to keep in training. Indeed, it has become an absolute necessity, and notoriously so, that in fairness to owners, and in the best interests of the turf, the scale of weights should be raised and the courses lengthened.'—Page 200.

These remarks may be commended to the notice of the Jockey Club, while as a matter of fact it may be stated, with regard to two of our most popular handicaps, that they have been won oftener by horses above 6st. 7lbs. than by horses weighted below that figure; the 'Cesarewitch' has been won upon sixteen occasions by horses carrying from 5st. 3lbs. to 6st. 6lbs., and upon twenty-five occasions by horses with imposts ranging from 6st. 8lbs. to 8st. 5lbs. As to the 'Cambridgeshire,' it has been won on fifteen occasions by horses with weights under 6st. 7lbs., and upon twenty-six occasions by horses carrying weights ranging from 6st. 9lbs. to 8st. 9lbs. We have not space in which to transfer to our pages the many sensible remarks made by Mr. Day on the subject of jockeys

and the adjustment of weights. His argument in brief is, and we agree with him, that it would be better for all concerned if racehorses were to be ridden by men rather than young boys. When that comes to be the case, we shall probably hear less of the preposterous bribery which is involved in the system of giving presents of money and expensive jewellery to young lads who have, at their age, only a hazy notion of their value and usually squander their gold and notes in betting and other questionable ways. The appointment of an official handicapper by the Jockey Club, and acting altogether independently of the owners or lessees of racecourses, would be a fitting corollary to the reform in weights which we recommend.

There are other obvious remedies which the Jockey Club might easily devise for turf grievances. The 'welsher,' for instance, the man who makes bets in ready money without the remotest intention of paying them, might be abolished by the very simple plan of licensing the honest bookmaker who pays when he loses; a ticket or badge worn on the sleeve of his coat would at once denote the authorised speculator. There are economists and publicists who say that the spirit of gambling is so inherent in the people that it will never be put down; and that, if betting on horse-racing were to be abolished, some new form of gambling would at once take its place, and that, therefore, betting should be tolerated and licensed. It may prove so. The haste among all classes to acquire riches is rampant; probably fifty commercial men out of every hundred are seeking a short cut to fortune, either in the produce market, or on the Stock Exchange, or on the turf. We have shown, we think, by our facts and illustrations, how few succeed in finding fortune on the racecourse, unless they take to bookmaking or dishonourable courses. This may be assumed as certain—that to attain success on the turf by fair means requires the same qualities of mental ability and bodily activity which would ensure prosperity in any other walk of life. At all events, fortunes, except in rare instances, will never be made by haphazard gambling, and we should be glad to see horse-racing in its best aspects flourishing without the adjunct of the bookmaker. If the bookmaking interest cannot be stamped out, then the Jockey Club must be asked to do the next best thing; the members of that body will have ultimately so to regulate the sport as to conserve all that is good in it, by throwing out or reducing in magnitude its worst elements. But they should remember that reform is most powerful when it begins at home.

- ART. VI.—1. *A Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland from 1641 to 1652*. Now for the first time published. With an Appendix of Original Letters and Documents. Edited by JOHN T. GILBERT, F.S.A., M.R.I.A., &c. Vol. I., Parts 1 & 2. Dublin (for the Irish Archæological and Celtic Society): 1879.
2. *The Embassy in Ireland of Monsignor G. B. Rinuccini, Archbishop of Fermo in the years 1645–1649*. Published from the original MSS. in the Rinuccini Library, by G. AJAZZA, Librarian. Translated for the first time into English by ANNIE HUTTON. Dublin: 1873.
3. *The History of the Warr of Ireland from 1641 to 1653*. By a British Officer of the Regiment of Sir John Clottworthy. Edited, with Preface, Notes, and Appendix, by E. H. Dublin: 1873.
4. *Spicilegium Ossoriense*. Being a Collection of Original Letters and Papers illustrative of the History of the Irish Church from the Reformation to the year 1800. By the Right Rev. PATRICK FRANCIS MORAN, D.D., Bishop of Ossory. Dublin: First Series, 1874; Second Series, 1878.
5. *An Historical Account of the Macdonnells of Antrim*. By Rev. GEORGE HILL. Belfast: 1873.

FEW episodes in our history have caused more discussion or roused livelier animosity than the Irish Rebellion of 1641, not only on account of its intrinsic importance, but because it exercised a powerful influence over the great constitutional struggle of the seventeenth century. The book of which the title heads this article casts a flood of light on the subject. It contains a narrative of the events from 1641 to the end of 1648, written immediately after they occurred, and called an ‘Aphorismical Discovery of Treasonable Faction.’ The MS., which is unique, has lain unpublished, though not quite unknown, ever since, and has passed through several hands to a safe resting-place in Trinity College, Dublin. Mr. Gilbert does not profess to know the writer’s name; but internal evidence shows that he was an ardent Catholic, and a native of Ireland of mixed race. He makes an ostentatious display of learning, heading each chapter with an ‘aphorism,’ often drawn from such little-read authors as Procopius and Velleius Paterculus. Mr. Gilbert, however, detracts from the merit of this erudition by remarking that most of the aphorisms are taken at second hand from a compilation by Sir Robert Dal-

lington. The author shows an acquaintance with continental writers, but scarcely any with the literature or the laws of England. His love of Horace does not always prevent him from being obscure in the effort to be brief. His great hero is Owen Roe O'Neill, to whom he dedicates the book under the name of Don Eugenius, but whom he afterwards usually calls General Neyll, or the Catholic General. The end of the dedicatory epistle is a good specimen both of his style and of his opinions:—

‘And as the young Maccabæus, fighting for God’s cause, received as he thought in a dream, by the hands of Jeremias, the holy prophet, a golden sword, in the delivery whereof said, “*Accipe sanctum gladium, munus a Deo, in quo dejicies adversarios populi mei Israel,*” so did you, type and presentative of that Machabæus, receive, not by a dream, or vision, and by the hands of the prophet, but verily and really by the hands of God’s superintendent and viceregent in this sublunall Jerusalem, a costly sword, as a gift immediately from the visible steerer of Peter’s navy. This, sir, is the justice of your cause, the equity of your warfare, and the antiquity of your regal claim, which no other nation under the cope of heaven, that we know, can brag of so long continuance in actual possession, as your predecessors, hard upon 3,000 years, except ninety-nine years, which is between the styling Henry VIII. King of Ireland, and the beginning of the new war 1641, as above mentioned, and that same not without claim. To set out your encomies to the world’s view by such an unpolished pen (as mine is) were rather a temerity in me than anyway suiting to your greatness and worth.

‘All the best sort of antiquarists and historiographers do hold you for blood no less than royal, in behaviour a prince, in arms Mars, in bounty Alexander, in wisdom Solomon, in faithfulness David, in learning Euclides, and in languages Gaolglas (the Erse Cadmus); in saying only Don Eugenius O’Neyll is praise enough, as comprehending all the former epitomes. Live then in heaven, the earth being not worthy of such a masterpiece, to get your journal, a crown of glory for your religious intentions, which is the daily desire of, sir, your most humble and faithful servant,

‘P. S.’

The fanciful reference to Henry VIII. shows that the lawyers were right in advising him to assume the regal title; in those days a divinity hedged the very name of king. The writer’s great aversion is Ormonde; but he has venom to spare for everyone who opposed O’Neill or the Nuncio, not excepting the orthodox Clanricarde.

The ‘Aphorismical Discovery’ was known to the omnivorous Carte, but failed to gain his approbation; for he says it is ‘wrote with so much partiality, fury, and virulence, and contains throughout it such notorious falsehoods, even in the relation of the same facts which are mentioned and related

‘otherwise in the nuncio’s Memoirs, that I could make no use of it, because it deserved no credit.’* There is a good deal of truth in this criticism. Our author was employed by Owen Roe as secretary, and says that he was a soldier and an eye-witness. It will therefore be pretty safe to trust him where O’Neill’s army is concerned, but his authority must give way to the nuncio’s in matters of policy. We must also remember that O’Neill was one of the most reserved of men, and is not likely to have confided his motives to noisy and intolerant partisans.

Giovan Batista Rinuccini, Archbishop of Fermo, was sent by Innocent X. to Ireland, where he arrived just four years after the outbreak of the rebellion, and where he remained until after the death of Charles I. The history of this mission was published at Florence in 1844, from the original compiled under the direction of the nuncio’s brother, and is extremely valuable for the information it contains as to the policy of Rome and the position of the Church in Ireland. Until the spring of 1647, Rinuccini’s main correspondence was, nominally at least, with Cardinal Pamphili, the Pope’s nephew. The cardinal became a layman in order to marry an heiress; but the nuncio’s piety stood the test, and considered the proceeding ‘worthy of the highest praise, since his Holiness has accepted his resignation,’ and hoped ‘that by thus providing for the succession of his family the life and happiness of his Holiness may be secured.’ After this the chief recipient of his confidence is Cardinal Panzirolo (or Pancirolo, as Ranke calls him), Secretary of the Congregation. The translation of this book apparently leaves little to be desired, and is very readable; but there has been careless editing, either in Florence or Dublin. Thus the Italian editor is called Aiazza on the title-page, and Aiazzi in the preface. The dates connected with the voyage to Ireland are hopeless. Rinuccini says he sailed on Monday, October 18th, 1645, made land for the first time on Saturday evening, and went ashore on Sunday. Immediately afterwards he says land was discovered and touched on the 21st and 22nd (pp. 80-84). The difference of style will not help us here. The last sentence of the king’s French letter to the nuncio seems impossible to construe, though the meaning may be guessed (p. 104). In passing through cipher it may have undergone the fate which sometimes befalls foreign telegrams. Carte had access to, and frequently cites, a MS. at Holkham, copied from an original

* Preface to Carte’s ‘Ormonde.’

still preserved in Italy, which contains the substance of these memoirs; but some discrepancies may be detected. Thus the nuncio's important report on the state of Ireland is placed by Carte at May 3, 1646, whereas in the 'Embassy' it is dated March 1.

The 'Warr of Ireland' is a short account of events, many of which were witnessed by the writer, who seems to have been a soldier of the Dalgetty type, more zealous for the laws and usages of war than for king or Parliament. The original is lost, but appears from internal evidence to have been written between 1682 and 1685, and the history is not therefore strictly contemporary. The transcript printed from it has been pronounced by experts to date from 1756 or thereabouts, and is preserved at Clongowes Wood College along with copies of the famous 'Macariæ Excidium' and of the 'Description of Ireland,' anno 1598, written in the same hand. We believe it is no secret that the editor's initials are those of the Rev. Edmund Hogan, S.J., who has also published a 'Description of Ireland.'

Bishop Moran's very valuable collection of documents includes several of great interest connected with the rebellion of 1641, drawn chiefly from Roman archives. The editing is excellent, and the work must be of great use to historical enquirers. An elaborate account of the 'Jesuit Missions in Ireland from 1641 to 1650' is likely to be one of the most generally interesting of these papers.*

By his wholesale disturbance of titles and his despotic behaviour generally, Strafford increased discontent, and not only among the despoiled natives. No one felt safe, for he contrived to insult and oppress 'all that most illustrates the contemporary annals of Ireland, the venerable learning of Usher, the pious integrity of Bedell, the experienced wisdom of Cork, and the early virtue of Clanricarde.'† But, though he excited general hatred, the strength of Wentworth's hand was such that he was able to repress the elements of disorder. He raised an army, consisting principally of Catholics, which would have been used against Scotland, and ultimately, though the intention was not actually proved at the trial, against England also. The strong hand was suddenly withdrawn, and the plan for transferring the soldiers to the service of foreign princes was not carried out. A crowd of hungry men trained to the use of arms, though not actually armed, were

* *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 2nd series, p. 43.

† Hallam, 'Const. Hist.,' chap. xviii.

let loose upon a society with the structure of which a majority had no sympathy. Owen O'Neill, who was in Flanders, longing for an opportunity to interfere in Irish affairs, soon heard the news of the partially abortive rising, 'upon receipt of which the said colonel was in a great rage against the discoverer (O'Connolly), and said he wondered how or where that villain should live, for if he were in Ireland sure they would pull him in pieces there, and if he lived in England there were footmen and other Irishmen enough to kill him.' * It was less than eight years since another Irish colonel, Walter Butler, had assassinated Wallenstein. The insurrection was quite certain to be attended with great barbarity; for, as Ranke puts it, 'the motives of the Sicilian Vespers and of the night of St. Bartholomew were united.' †

Events had placed the gentry of the Pale in a position of extraordinary difficulty. Many of them were probably aware of what was impending, but as a rule they took no part in the outbreak, feeling instinctively that, though religion might bind them to the Irish for a time, nothing could really obliterate the distinctions of race. Ambrose Bedell often heard the Irish say to the Old English:—'You churls with the great breeches, do you think, if we were rid of the English, that we would spare you? No, we would cut all your throats also; for you are all of one race with the other English, though we make use of you for the present.' ‡ Nor had they much to expect from the Parliament, should it prove too strong for the King. Their first impulse was to offer their services to the State, and ten peers did so in person, demanding arms to defend themselves. Five hundred pikes and muskets were grudgingly given to Lord Gormianstown, whose lands lay near the Ulster frontier, none to any of the others, who, seeing that they were not trusted, retired to their country houses and waited upon events. On December 3 the Lords Justices sent letters to the nobility of the Pale, desiring them to come to Dublin within a week to confer upon the state of the kingdom, a summons which only three obeyed. Of these one was George, sixteenth Earl of Kildare, whose family a century before had been the greatest stumbling-block of English governors. The policy of educating the great men in England had so far succeeded. Kildare was a Protestant, and of two

* Information of Henry Cartan, Quartermaster to Colonel O'Neill's regiment. Gilbert, p. 398.

† History of England, Oxford translation, vol. ii. p. 287.

‡ Carte, book iii.

evils he chose what seemed the least. Shortly afterwards that very castle of Maynooth which had been defended so stoutly against Henry VIII. was taken and plundered by the Catholics. The other Lords of the Pale protested their loyalty, but declared that they had reason to distrust the Viceregal Government, and that they preferred to give advice from a safe distance. Outrages on both sides followed in quick succession. On December 11 a deputation from the Ulster Irish met seven lords at the hill of Crofty in Meath, and Lord Gormanstown demanded for what cause they came armed into the Pale. Roger More answered that they had taken the sword only for freedom of conscience, equal rights for Irishmen as for Englishmen, and for the maintenance of his Majesty's prerogative, which they understood was abridged. Much writing and talking ensued, but the result could not be doubtful. Unable to support or to trust a government controlled by Puritans, the unlucky descendants of the Anglo-Norman conquerors were forced into the arms of the Irish; but oil and vinegar were not less capable of fusion, and the hostile ingredients were always asserting themselves.

While the Lords of the Pale were making up their puzzled minds, the flames reached Munster, which was under the presidency of Sir William St. Leger, an able officer, but too exclusively devoted to hanging as an instrument of government. The Butlers were divided by religion from Ormonde, but they and other old English families might perhaps have remained quiet had the Lord President been conciliatory. Philip O'Dwyer, whom he had called traitor, raised the standard of revolt in Tipperary; and Ormonde's uncle, Lord Mountgarret, and his cousins, Lords Ikerrin and Dunboyne, having declared themselves, that county and Kilkenny were soon in Catholic hands. The Boyle family held their ground stoutly at Lismore, Youghal, and Bandon, causing Cromwell to remark that the Irish could never have rebelled had there been an Earl of Cork in every county. Lord Inchiquin, known to fame as 'Murrough of the burnings,' was vice-president of Munster, and made a strong stand in Cork and Limerick. Lord Barrymore was the only one of the old Munster nobles who took the Protestant side. The virtuous Clanricarde, who has been by very general consent pronounced one of the most faultless characters of any age, was governor of the county and town of Galway, and by his exertions peace was at first maintained in Connaught. The ferocious O'Flaherties, for deliverance from whom the citizens of Galway were accustomed to pray, were in full rebellion in Connemara,

but they were too poor and too far off to have much influence on the contest.

The county of Leitrim differed from the rest of Connaught in having undergone a plantation. A considerable slice of the ancient Brefny had indeed been reserved to the O'Rourkes, but they could not be pleased to see the fairest portions of their former principality in the hands of Scotchmen.

'These fertile fields, that softened vale,
Were once the birthright of the Gael ;'

and he was ready to get them back if he could. Of the settlers the most considerable was Sir Frederick Hamilton, of the house of Abercorn, who was at Londonderry when the rebellion broke out, and who immediately started for his strong castle at Manorhamilton, attended by only a dozen servants. By carrying two lighted matches apiece, and by frequently blowing trumpets, the little party were mistaken for a troop, and were unmolested on their night march through the mountains, a few Scots stragglers joining on the road. Hamilton reached home with twenty men, after killing a few rogues. Connor O'Rourke, who held the office of sheriff, was friendly at first, but after a few days Hamilton's own Irish tenants deserted him, and he was practically besieged with some fifty Scots. The investment being careless, they made many successful sallies, and, hearing that some English had been slain at Sligo, Sir Frederick had a high gallows erected outside his castle, upon which eight out of twenty-four prisoners were hanged in retaliation. A list is given of fifty-six prisoners, including one woman, thus summarily disposed of in fourteen months. Little regard was anywhere paid to sex during this horrible war, nor did women always show it themselves. During an ambuscade in Westmeath, contrived by one of the young Dillons, a few peasants with spades and other rude weapons,

'with the feminean sex followed . . . the women were not idle, the ascending vapour of their liquor caused them to be somewhat bloody. As many as they found tumbling (though striving to get upon his legs) did dash out his brains with stones, and though their skulls mortered to powder, never thought them dead enough ; twenty-three were killed and one escaped.' *

Incursions were made into the surrounding country, and men, sometimes women too, were killed in their beds. Battles took place under the walls, Lady Hamilton coming out and serving food and wine to the soldiers. On July 1, 1642, the

* Gilbert, p. 59.

daring Hamilton entered Sligo, burning the abbey with the friars in it, except two who were killed in their cowls running out, and it was 'confessed by themselves we destroyed that night 300 souls by fire, sword, and drowning, to God's everlasting great honour and glory and our comfort.' Three weeks later the journal has some bitter strictures on Sir W. Cole for leaving Hamilton to his fate, or sending him such help as Dr. Barkley, who annoyed Sir Frederick by his meddling, and behaved 'more like a devil than a dean,' encouraging the soldiers to murmur against the strict discipline maintained. The dean probably got on badly with his host, who was a zealous Covenanter. The great want of the garrison was salt, their raids securing an abundance of other provisions. On one occasion Hamilton caught a girl, and sent her to the rebels with a letter from his Irish soldiers, to which all the signatories are Celts, who call the rebellion barbarous, abominable, and detestable, and the Irish leader, Lucas Taafe, 'a lowsy lord's son.' They revile their countrymen for 'blowing away the powder, blest and sent by the Pope to other purpose than to shoot at our colonel's castle from the top of Benbowe—once more farewell and be hanged.' Letters, sometimes threatening, sometimes coaxing, were received both by Hamilton and his wife, often referring to former friendship and protesting loyalty and patriotism. To one of these the following uncompromising answer was sent:—

'Your loyalty to your king, your faith to your friends once broke never more to be trusted by me, but revenged as God shall enable the hands of him who was loving to your loyal predecessors, whose curse will contribute to your destruction, for extinguishing the memory of their loyalties. Thus I rest with contempt and scorn to all your base bragges. Your scourge if I can, 'F. H.'

The Irish failed to take his castle, and Hamilton lived to carry his grievance against Cole to the English Parliament. Dr. Curry compared his cruelties to those of Sir Charles Coote.

One week after the outbreak Owen O'Connell himself brought the news to the Parliament at Westminster. Immediate steps were taken for sending relief, and enough money to provide for the defence of Dublin was despatched at once. The king was in Scotland, but returned to London in less than a month; it was more than two before he took the usual step of proclaiming the insurgents rebels, specially directing that no more than forty copies of the proclamation should be printed.* It was even reported in foreign Catholic circles that

* May's 'Long Parliament,' pp. 152 and 406, ed. 1854.

he had forbidden the Irish to be called rebels, saying they were only conspirators—a nice distinction indeed.* Four days after the proclamation Charles paid his fatal visit to the House of Commons. Does his slowness to take a more direct course lend any strength to the suspicion that he had secret dealings with the Irish army?

It is well known that Sir Phelim O'Neill exhibited a royal commission with a great seal attached, and historians have generally taken for granted that the document was an impudent forgery. The only real authority for so considering it is the statement of John Kerr, Dean of Ardagh, who deposed in 1681 that he had heard Sir Phelim confess the cheat on his trial in Dublin in 1652, the very year in which Kerr was ordained priest.† Kerr's deposition may be read in Nalson, and the question turns very much on his credibility or accuracy; for, with the Glamorgan correspondence staring us in the face, there is no denying that the king was capable of giving such a commission as the rebel leader professed to have obtained, and equally capable of disavowing it afterwards. The dean's evidence, which has some contemporary confirmation, goes to show that the commission was under the great seal of England; whereas Sir Phelim's proclamation of November 4, 1641, declared it to be under the great seal of Scotland, which could be of no force in Ireland, but which was easier to get at and to explain away afterwards. Mr. Burton gives many cogent reasons for supposing that the point is at least arguable, and to his pages the reader is referred.‡ Spurious or genuine, O'Neill's commission was not the only one that did duty in the early days of the war; for Lord Muskerry, at a time when he was actually in rebellion, produced one to St. Leger, which gave him authority to raise 4,000 men for the king. If this was a forgery, it was at least a skilful one; for St. Leger believed it to be genuine, and he must have seen many such documents.§

Help came slowly from England, and it was nearly six months after the outbreak before Ormonde, with 3,500 men, was able to meet Mountgarret with 8,000, 'who, without difficulty, choosed to be looser himself in that game, than his nephew not to be victor in this his first action.'|| Mount-

* *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, vol. i. p. 257.

† Cotton's '*Fasti*,' vol. iii. p. 103.

‡ *History of Scotland*, vol. vi. p. 344. Ed. 1876.

§ Smith's '*Cork*,' from a MS. at Lismore, vol. ii. p. 118. Ed. 1750.

|| Gilbert, p. 30.

garret is likely to have done his best; but it is very possible that many Butlers of humbler rank disliked bearing arms against the head of the house of Ormonde, to which they and theirs had been accustomed to yield all the reverence due both from a tribesman to his chief, and from a feudal vassal to his superior lord.

Two days after Mountgarret's defeat a Scottish army landed at Carrickfergus, under the command of Robert Monroe, acting as lieutenant to the elder Lesley; and throughout the war this force maintained a separate existence, corresponding pretty closely to that of the Scots colony in Ulster. The Estates offered 10,000 men, but the English Parliament was afraid of their gaining too great a mastery, and about 4,000 only actually landed, a force which was afterwards considerably increased. Leven soon afterwards came over himself, but did nothing worthy of his reputation; and that stout old campaigner, Sir James Turner, speaks of his proceedings with much contempt:—

'The Earl of Leven got himself an errand to go to Scotland, and so gave an everlasting adieu to Ireland. The most remarkable thing he did in the time of his stay was, that he took 2,500 lb. sterline to himself, which the Parliament of England had sent to the officers of his army for waggon money. And truly this earl, who lived till he was past fourscore, was of so good a memory, that he was never known to forget himself, nay, not in extreme age. . . . The earl of Leven's actions made not such noise in the world as those of General Lesley.*

Monroe was honourably distinguished by the substitution of regular warfare for the barbarous guerilla contest hitherto maintained, and he must share the praise with Owen O'Neill, 'who both gave fair quarters like soldiers, and halted those 'inhumane acts before done.'†

Towards the end of July, 1642, Owen Roe O'Neill, accompanied by some good officers and with a cargo of arms and ammunition, arrived in Lough Swilly. This favourite hero of a lost cause was Tyrone's nephew, and, having been educated in the Irish Franciscan monastery at Louvain, had served Spain with much credit against the French, and had been entrusted by Urban VIII. with money to equip a frigate for the Irish expedition. The struggle created intense interest abroad, and Colgan, the hagiologist, wrote from Louvain to Wadding at Rome, estimating the Irish army at 80,000 or 100,000, which must be considered an exaggeration if an army means armed men. 'Sed laborantes penuriâ armorum, pulveris tor-

* Quoted by Hill, p. 262.

† Warr of Ireland, p. 9.

‘mentarii, tormentorum et similium apparatusum ad tale bellum necessariorum.’* Colgan thought that if the Irish had supplies they would soon finish the war, and the sanguine exile’s only fear was lest any truce should be made, without which his correspondents assured him the English had scarcely any hope of reducing the island. Irish friars had not yet learned the lesson which Runjeet Sing laid so much to heart, that it was England’s invisible strength which was most to be feared. The English Government were fully aware of Owen Roe’s design, and the Channel was closely watched; but he avoided the danger, ‘coming by sea from Dunkirk by Denmark, gave ‘a wheel about Scotland, taking on his way two prizes.’† He at once assumed the command of the Ulster army, which had dwindled under Sir Phelim’s management to 1,500 foot and eight or nine troops of horse. Sir Phelim was as anxious as other O’Neills had been for supremacy in Ulster, and was so ill-advised as to assume the title of Tyrone, to which he had no sort of hereditary claim, and which he was obliged to abandon on the appearance of his kinsman, with whom he never co-operated cordially. The new general wrote to Lesley to ask him whether he was for king or Parliament, a friend or an enemy. If the latter, he advised him to use his sword for the defence of Scotland, and not to shed the blood of innocent men who had never hurt him. Otherwise, he said, ‘I will ‘use my uttermost endeavours against you (though unwilling), ‘and do confide in God Almighty, who knows the justice of ‘my cause and the injustice of yours, as he gave me the victory ‘over you one day in Germany, as you should remember yourself, if you do not too-too much halte [*sic*]), his Divine Providence will be pleased to make me an instrument of lessening ‘you by your head,’ &c. According to the ‘Aphorismical ‘Discovery,’ this letter frightened Lesley out of Ireland.‡

After the first surprise, six months’ constant fighting had not improved the position of the insurgents, who felt the want of some central authority. The clergy naturally took the lead, and a provincial synod met at Kells on March 22, 1642, under the presidency of the titular primate, Hugh O’Neill. The war was declared just, and the faithful were exhorted to aid it. Thomas Dease, titular Bishop of Meath, a learned canonist and a witty poet, who had honourably distinguished himself by trying to save his Protestant rival’s library, refused to attend or to send a proxy, and ordered his clergy not to obey the synod. Dease lived in the house of Lord Westmeath,

* Gilbert, p. 407.

† Ibid. p. 43.

‡ Ibid. p. 45.

head of the great family whose founder married Hugo de Lacy's sister, and received as her dowry the broad territory of Delvin. The peer, who was very old, supported his guest, and, on their refusing to justify themselves or to recant, both were excommunicated. Afterwards a young Cistercian, Fr. James Nugent, was sent to preach at the poor old lord, and we are told with such effect, that he called the bishop Satan, and desired the monk to 'get a whip and absolve him . . . which 'was done incontinently.'* The Nugents were thus reduced to a proper state of spiritual subjection, but Dease continued contumacious, and remained Bishop of Meath in the eye of the Holy See until his death in 1657.

On the 10th May following, what purported to be a national synod met at Kilkenny, and was attended by nine prelates, four bishops' proctors, and sixteen abbots and other dignitaries. An oath of association was agreed upon, it was resolved to ask aid from foreign princes, and a national assembly was convoked for the following October. A provisional government under Mountgarret's presidency was formed to act in the meantime.

Before the appointed date the English civil war had begun, and on the day after Edgehill Thomas Preston, Lord Gormanstown's brother, landed at Wexford. He brought with him a considerable military reputation, which he was not fated to increase in Ireland, two 20-gun frigates, and half-a-dozen vessels laden with ammunition and with a train of artillery. For some time supplies continued to pour in from France, and Carte says that no less than 20 shiploads arrived about this time. The Irish soldiers in the French service had been generally discharged, and men and officers flocked homeward. Had the Irish been united, they must have taken Dublin, where the English garrison, whom the king could not help and the Parliament would not, were in want of almost every necessary.

Eleven spiritual and fourteen temporal peers and 226 commoners constituted the assembly, which met at Kilkenny, and which, being nominally in the king's interest, disclaimed the now dreaded name of Parliament. There was, moreover, a Protestant Rump existing in Dublin, which was, no doubt, the legal Parliament, and Kilkenny was full of lawyers. The most important act of the assembly was to appoint a supreme council, which formed the Catholic executive. The oath of association which formed the bond of the confederacy is thus given by Belling: †—

‘I, N. N., swear before Almighty God, his angels and saints, that I will defend the liberty of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman faith, the person, heirs, and rights (*jura*) of our most serene King Charles; also the legitimate immunities and liberties of this nation against all usurpers and invaders at the risk of all my fortunes and of life itself.’

The longer English form of oath preserved by Walsh * is essentially the same, with the additional undertaking to obey the Supreme Council, and not to make terms without its consent. Both forms provide for the free, but not necessarily for the open, exercise of the Roman Catholic faith. The second form also promises to maintain the essential laws of Ireland, ‘and the lives, just liberties, possessions, estates, and rights of all those that have taken or shall take this oath, and perform the covenants thereof.’ Thus was Catholic rule established in Ireland.

Magna Charta and the laws of England were to be the foundation of the Irish Constitution, and an elaborate system of local government was devised. Preston was appointed general for Leinster, and Owen Roe for Ulster, and, to avoid exciting jealousies among the Munster nobles, the command in that province was given to a gallant old soldier, Colonel Barry. Connaught was assigned to Colonel John Bourke, until Clanricarde could be induced to take charge of it. Dissensions soon sprang up at Kilkenny, the rift within the lute being caused by the same difficulty which sent the young man away sorrowful. Catholics had become impropiators of church lands as readily as Protestants, and they had not the slightest intention of disgorging. The Benedictines were told that existing settlements and contracts could not be disturbed. The provincial of the Augustinians was hissed out of the House because he threatened to withdraw beyond sea unless the possessions of his order were restored.

For a confederacy whose chief business was likely to be fighting, the choice of a standard was of some importance, and Bishop Moran has unearthed some interesting particulars from the Wadding papers at Rome. The national green may perhaps be derived from the order that on the right of each flag should be the cross of Ireland, ‘in cujus circuitu color ruber in campo viridi.’ Under the cross was ‘Long live King Charles,’ and above ‘C. R.’ and an imperial crown. The flags themselves were of all colours, bearing figures and mottoes or texts from Scripture, which sometimes involved political allusions. Thus the red ones bore the name of Jesus, with the text, ‘In the

'name of Jesus every knee shall bow;' this was to refute the Act of Parliament against genuflexions. On the silver ensigns was an armed knight setting fire to Calvin's Institutes, and the words, 'Thus let heresies perish.'*

About the time of Preston's landing Ormonde was created a marquis and Lieutenant-General for the King, independently of the Lords Justices and of the phantom Lord Lieutenant in England. Henceforth he was the unquestionable representative of the king in military matters, and the royalism of the Catholic armies was subjected to a severe strain. The Lords Justices inclined to the Parliament, but the army was entirely Ormonde's, and a committee of the Houses who visited Dublin were obliged to leave the capital in his hands. Early in 1643 he received the king's authority to treat with the rebels, a name which the Council of Kilkenny indignantly repudiated, and, fearful lest the priests should oppose all overtures, he requested that laymen only should be deputed to confer with him. Extremes met in this strange contest, and the Puritan Lords Justices, fearing lest Ormonde's and Preston's armies might both be made available for the king's service in England, were as much against a truce as the Romanist bishops. Under these circumstances the negotiations hung fire, hostilities were renewed, and Ormonde, falling upon Preston at New Ross, defeated him utterly. The Catholic historian, who is ready to cry treason at every disappointment, declares 'Preston either 'drunk, a fool, or a traitor.'† He was simply an incompetent general.

Three months after this, Owen Roe O'Neill was defeated at Clones by Sir Robert Stewart. He had great difficulty in provisioning his men, and was obliged to wander about with herds of cattle, and the nomad herdsmen of Ulster, who, under the name of *creaghts*, were so important in the Elizabethan wars. These drovers were accompanied by their 'women and 'children, so that nothing could be seen or heard but cows and 'running.' His panegyrist says that he was persuaded to fight against his own opinion by a council of war largely composed of native chiefs. The British officer, however, says distinctly that O'Neill was surprised.‡ The Irish Cunctator, as he has been well called, probably learned here the weak points of his men, and persevered until he had trained them into a formidable army. The Ulster men lived hard, loved fighting, and cared nothing for money; and their leader was able to

* *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 2nd series, pp. 17, 18.

† Gilbert, p. 62.

‡ Warr of Ireland, p. 29.

expand or contract his forces at will, as he had food and powder to give them or work for them to do. In Scottish warfare Highland armies were equally ready to disperse, but no general was ever able to reassemble them as easily as O'Neill reassembled his Irishmen.

The low state of the Confederates' fortunes helped on the truce, which was concluded for one year on September 15, 1643, on the basis of *uti possidetis*. This armistice foreshadowed the final defeat of the Catholic cause; for two years war had failed to secure the principle of a full toleration, and the original enthusiasm was cooling. When fighting stopped, jealousies developed rapidly. Pier Francesco Scarampi, an Oratorian, had been sent over by Urban VIII. to guard the interests of the Church, and the native Irish party, who cared nothing for the English Crown or Constitution, gathered eagerly round him. Scarampi and his followers, with a true instinct, opposed the truce, but the Anglicising party, as usual, carried their point.

The real gainer by the Cessation, as it was called, was Ormonde, who yielded nothing of importance, and was too badly supplied to carry things with a high hand. He now sent about 4,000 men to England, who were required to take a special oath both to the king and to the Church of England. Monk was one of two officers who refused the test, but he was not deprived of his command. The Parliamentarians gave out that the new-comers were bloody Irish papists, but Clarendon says there was not an Irishman among them. After some trifling successes they were routed by Fairfax at Nantwich, and the diversion had no effect on the main issue. Monk was among the prisoners, and after a decent interval took service with the Parliament. The confederated Catholics, though nominally in arms for the king, refused to send him succours into England. It was certainly not their interest that he should be too triumphant; on the other hand, they should have striven to prevent his being crushed. They failed to attempt this, and English and Irish cavaliers were thus trodden down in detail.

The expedition into Scotland, contrived by Antrim at the suggestion of Montrose and with the help of Daniel O'Neill, and sanctioned both by Ormonde and the Kilkenny Council, had no better ultimate success; but it has furnished our history with one of its most picturesque pages. Antrim, whom Clarendon and Carte describe as of small capacity and inordinate vanity, had come to court early in life, and his handsome person had captivated Buckingham's widow.

Having run through most of his wife's fortune, he fell back on his immense Irish estate, and at the beginning of the rebellion made a feeble attempt to stand neutral. Having suffered two imprisonments at Monroe's hands, he gave up this idea, and offered to raise men for the king's service in Scotland. He fancied that the mantle of the Lords of the Isles had fallen upon him, and that he was destined to curb the usurpers of Inverary. On arriving at Oxford in December, 1643, this visionary, whose duchess had a good deal of influence, naturally fell under Montrose's ascendancy, who saw in him the very man he wanted. The king could give neither men, nor money, nor ships; but he was still the fountain of honour, and he made Antrim a marquis, encouraging him to hope for the duchy of Argyll when the hated Campbells had been got rid of. He received a commission to treat with the Confederates, and Daniel O'Neill was sent with him to prevent his uncle, Owen Roe, from making difficulties, and to supply the address and resolution in which the new marquis was considered deficient. This able and versatile intriguer, whom Ormonde was particularly fond of, was to be rewarded by the post of Gentleman of the Bed-chamber which he coveted, and may have hoped to recover part of the estates out of which Scottish settlers had swindled his grandfather. Antrim went to Kilkenny, and received a lieutenant-general's commission from the Supreme Council, who offered to provide arms for his men. Daniel O'Neill's diplomacy did much, for Owen Roe made no objection to recruits being drawn out of his province, and Ormonde pledged his own estate to the shipmasters for transport. After many bickerings Waterford was chosen for the place of embarkation, and about 1,600 men ultimately landed in Argyllshire. It was in this body of 'Irishes' that Dugald Dalgetty held a major's commission. The chief command was held by Alaster McDonnell, son of Col Kittagh, or Two-handed Coll. Alaster himself was often called Colkitto, and will be to the end of time, for the name is embalmed in Milton's sonnet as one of those words which 'would have made Quintilian stare and gasp,' and it is also applied to him by Scott, Clarendon, and Carte. He was correctly called Mac Col Kittagh, and the prefix was easily dropped. The family historian * is jubilant at having caught Mr. Burton tripping by confusing the personal and the local and calling him McDonnell of Colkitto. Some English writers,

* Hill, p. 83.

it seems, have not unnaturally spoken of him as a Colonel Kitto.

The Ulster contingent shared in all Montrose's victories from Tippermuir to Kilsyth. Shortly after the latter fight, Alaster himself left Montrose, and, returning after a time to Ireland, fell in battle on the Englishman's Hill near Mallow. The author of the 'Aphorismical Discovery' says very positively and with great circumstance that he was murdered after quarter given, but Rinuccini says distinctly that he refused quarter.* Seven hundred of his men remained behind in Scotland to furnish victims for the carnage of Philiphaugh. It is not likely that many escaped, for the camp-followers were massacred promiscuously, the preachers looking on and blessing the work. Even the prisoners were ordered by Parliament to be executed 'without any assize or process, conform to the treaty betwixt both kingdoms passed in act.'† Both English and Scotch Parliaments had passed ordinances directing no quarter to be given to Irish papists. The explanation of these barbarities is that English Protestants then looked upon Irish papists as Chatham did upon the Red Indians—hellhounds of savage war. The feeling extended to those who employed such auxiliaries, and Montrose did nothing to modify public feeling on the subject.

On September 15, 1644, Cardinal Pamphili was elected Pope by the name of Innocent X., and the confederates sent Richard Belling to congratulate him and to beg his aid. The emissary, who is now best remembered as author of the 'Vindiciæ,' was a good lawyer and an accomplished scholar, and had lately borne arms with credit; but he belonged heart and soul to the party of the Old English, and the Irish hated him.

'A tode in faction and a creature of Ormonde . . . went to Rome, where he was received with more honour than worthy of, got rich presents from his Holiness, and other princes and prelates . . . got 30,000*l.* for the furtherance of the Catholic war of Ireland . . . with what he got for his own particular use, addressed his course for Paris, and meeting there the banished Queen of England, gave her the said sum, all this by his own acknowledgment.'

His father had been Provost Marshal, 'a perjured enformer, whence sucked the blood of thousand innocents in Ireland, you should not marvel how impious soever this his brood be. What then would you expect at the hands of a child of such

* Gilbert, p. 174; *Embassy in Ireland*, p. 336.

† Hill, p. 105.

‘a father other than tricks, perjury, craft, collusion and ‘treachery?’* After hearing Belling, Innocent determined to send a nuncio to Ireland, who with higher rank should have larger powers than Scarampi could pretend to. Belling was bitterly opposed to the appointment, and his friends at Kilkenny said that they wanted money, but no nuncio. Some of them asked Scarampi if it was intended to set up anything like a legatine court in Ireland, and, on receiving an affirmative answer, declared that they would not put up with it.† A Spanish subject was first chosen by the Pope, but, to spare French susceptibilities, he finally decided upon Rinuccini, who was a Tuscan by birth.

By his secret instructions‡ the nuncio was directed to assure the Queen of England and her ‘powerful favourite,’ Lord Jermyn, of the Pope’s perfect goodwill, and to persuade her that Catholic support was absolutely necessary to the falling cause of royalty.

‘IV. The queen thus convinced, it will be useful to discover dexterously who has influence and authority over the Marquis of Ormonde, and, if he is dependent on the queen, to procure from her some letter . . . that if unwilling to give up Ulster and Dublin . . . openly into the hands of the Catholics . . . he may at least secretly assist them . . . and may defer to her wishes, as he certainly will do if he has the good of his country at heart, for he is Irish, and by some thought to be a Catholic in secret. . . .’

‘V. Interviews with the queen must be private, and so rare that the queen may not suspect their object, she being surrounded by heretics, both Protestant and Puritan. . . .’

‘VI. . . . Guard against the many English Catholics at the court, whose zeal for the faith is not ardent enough to hear with pleasure of the victory gained in its cause by the Irish, on account of the natural and undying hatred between the two nations. . . .’

Once in Ireland the nuncio was to keep near the more zealous ecclesiastics, but, if possible, not to arouse the suspicions of the Ormondists.

‘XIV. Let him promote the interests of the Catholic religion in such a manner as to show he considers it one with the English Crown. . . .’

‘XV. Stimulate the Catholics to concord . . . assure all who are in possession of ecclesiastical property that it will not be taken from them. . . .’

‘XIX. . . . Defeat with subtle industry the machinations of certain royalists, . . . who are desirous that the queen shall proceed to Ireland. . . .’

* Gilbert, p. 79.

† Embassy in Ireland, p. 436.

‡ Ibid. p. lii.

The king and queen were to be called upon to revoke all penal laws against Catholics, to abolish the oath of supremacy, to declare Catholics eligible for all civil and military employment, and to conclude no treaty with Parliament until articles to the foregoing effect had been ratified. As the Pope was unable to maintain an army of 200,000 men in England, it was hardly worth while for him to insist on such conditions, in order to secure which ‘all the fortresses in Ireland must be put into the hands of English and Irish Catholics, because, without some such pledge, their Majesties’ promise cannot be depended on.’ The character of Charles I. had been correctly gauged at Rome.

Rinuccini reached Genoa on April 15, 1645, where he was entrusted with the golden rose for the Queen of France, but with instructions not to present it unless he was sure that it would be well received—an assurance at which he never arrived. He stayed a fortnight at Genoa, and was received with great honours by Doge and Senate, the question as to whether he was ‘a nuncio of a crown’ having been decided in the affirmative. This is probably the only occasion in history on which a foreign power officially recognised the separate existence of Ireland; for Rinuccini was not sent to the viceroy, but to the confederacy, who claimed viceregal authority. Irish monks cheered the nuncio on his way through the South of France, but many of their sanguine reports were unfounded. At Lyons he received scant courtesy from the cardinal archbishop. Belling joined him on his arrival in Paris, and English and Irish Catholics flocked round him at once. At his audience the queen showed herself favourable to the Irish, but Mazarin, who was always in agonies lest he should be committed on the wrong side, did little to speed him.

Negotiations with Henrietta Maria were carried on chiefly through Belling and an Irish priest named O’Hartigan. Jermyn, whom the ‘Aphorismical Discovery’ calls the queen’s minion, throughout appears as her chief counsellor, and had several interviews with Rinuccini; but her personal attitude was one of distrust. ‘She spoke hardly of the Irish in this late rising, stigmatising them as rebels, and declaring that she would not acknowledge or receive me as nuncio, because my mission is to a rebellious people.’* All his endeavours failed to impress upon her that the Catholic was also the royal cause, and ‘she complained loudly of the Irish, and among them of O’Hartigan and the secretary (Belling), who from the first made use of the Catholic

* Embassy in Ireland, p. 40.

religion in general as a pretext to throw off their allegiance to the king, that they did not wish to make peace with him unless they saw it to be an absolute necessity, and were always adding new petitions, and more exorbitant than the last: on these two particulars she insisted with vehemence, and that they had dared to tell her that they would fight against the king to the last drop of their blood, if they did not obtain what they desired, and similar complaints.*

There was also a question as to whether the nuncio had a right to remain covered before her, and it was feared that if he conceded something to her forlorn condition, the French Court might take advantage of it. In the end no interview took place. It was proposed in the queen's interest that half of the money given by the Pope should be given to the English Catholics; but Rinuccini successfully combated this scheme, which would have lessened the importance of his mission. A sum of 20,000 scudi,† spent in munitions of war, was indeed entrusted by Innocent to Sir Kenelm Digby for service in England, and that eccentric genius was accused of culpably misapplying part of the money.

Rinuccini remained more than three months, though ordered to make all haste, and allowed himself to be the dupe, or at least the victim, of Mazarin's dilatory policy. The cardinal had already promised the Irish 24,000 crowns, and offered 5,000 more for the hire of vessels, which Rinuccini preferred to spend on the purchase of two frigates. Twenty-five thousand was paid after much haggling, 'that is,' said the nuncio, 'according to his reckoning, 5,000 for the ships and 20,000 for a donation, although I saw that the two sums should have amounted to 29,000.'‡ This money, with three or four pieces of cannon and the empty right of hoisting the French flag at sea, appears to have been the extent of the help received from France. The Government had tired of insular politics, finding that large sums previously sent to Charles had been wasted. The amount sent from Rome to Ireland through the nuncio seems not to have exceeded 30,000*l.*, but he sometimes raised money on credit, and he spent the revenues of his own see. It may be doubted whether the material help which Rinuccini gave was not too dearly bought by the dissensions which he caused.

Rinuccini left Paris at the end of August, 1645, but six weeks elapsed before his embarkation. On the eve of his departure from the capital he sent a letter to the Council of Kilkenny, regretting that he was delayed by the difficulty of finding a safe passage. He was all anxiety to be with them; for

* Embassy in Ireland, p. 50.

† Ibid. p. 560.

‡ Ibid. p. 58.

‘ex illâ siquidem die, quâ inspirante cœlitus Deo, Summus D. N. imbecillitatem meam ad onus hoc evangelicum destinavit, mirum dictu est, quâ ratione ex Italo in Hibernum repente mutatus, res vestras, ecclesiam vestram, istum ipsum erga fidem Catholicam animorum vestrorum ardorem, et ipse non minus ardens sin amplexatus.’ *

This hyperbole was not precisely suited to charm Mountgarret and Preston, who, though good Catholics, did not consider themselves Irish at all. Rinuccini did indeed espouse the Irish cause in the stricter sense, and found, when he held the Celtic nation, that the winning cards were, after all, in other hands.

The nuncio did not escape a sharp reproof from Rome for lingering on the road, and it was suggested somewhat ironically that he might send the money to Scarampi, if himself obliged to delay still further in France. Thus urged, but not without misgivings, he sailed from Rochelle accompanied by Belling and other Irishmen, and with a great quantity of stores. From Monday to Friday they were tossed about, and on the latter day were chased by two vessels. The Irish on board knew that they were commanded by a Puritan countryman of their own, who would not respect the golden lilies upon which Mazarin had set such value as a protection. Dreading to fall into Plunkett's hands, they made great efforts, and succeeded in distancing him. ‘It was noted . . . that the vessel was ‘dedicated to St. Peter . . . and truly I see the hand of ‘the Saint in the miraculous issue of this pursuit.’† The real cause of the nuncio's escape was a fire in the enemy's galley.‡

The nuncio had considerable difficulty in making the coast of Ireland, but at length on Saturday evening cast anchor in Kenmare Bay. The date, as has been before pointed out, is rather hard to fix, but it was about the middle of October, 1645. The pious nuncio was particularly pleased at certain chronological coincidences. The day on which land had been seen was that which the Church of Fermo held sacred to St. Mabel, one of the eleven thousand virgins. The day following was that on which the martyrdom of Philip, Bishop of Fermo, was celebrated. Belling regretted having missed Waterford, where prepared demonstrations awaited them; but Rinuccini rejoiced at having been obliged to land in a remote corner and to lodge in a cowshed, and saw some similitude to the ‘great work of the ‘Redemption first announced to shepherds and begun within

* Embassy in Ireland, p. 68.

† Ibid. p. 82.

‡ Castlehaven's ‘Memoirs,’ p. 62. Ed. 1815.

‘the walls of a stable.’* Yet he elsewhere censures the Irish for their proneness to believe in vain prophecies.

The people flocked round the nuncio, and a volunteer body-guard escorted him to the neighbourhood of Millstreet, where he was met by some troops of horse sent by the Kilkenny Council. The principal officers were Lord Netterville and Ormonde’s brother Richard, whom Rinuccini at first extolled as an excellent Catholic, but afterwards reviled when he found that he was no nuncionist. Thus conducted, the nuncio, who was astonished at the roughness of the roads, a reproach from which Munster is now pretty free, brought baggage and stores safe through the mountains to Limerick, and after a few days’ rest entered Kilkenny with great pomp. The inhabitants flocked out to meet him, the clergy assembling in great numbers at St. Patrick’s Church, and the magistrates being in waiting at the city gate. Wearing the pontifical cape and hat, Monsignore rode to the cathedral, ‘a distance perhaps not less ‘than that of the Via Lungara at Rome,’ the citizens walking bareheaded in the rain and carrying a canopy over his head. At the door of St. Canice’s the aged bishop, David Rothe, author of the ‘*Analecta*,’ received the procession, and, after offering the aspersorium, led Rinuccini to the high altar, and made a speech there. The nuncio pronounced a solemn benediction and granted the promised indulgences, and then there was another oration. The reception by the Supreme Council, which was arranged by Belling, seems to have been not altogether satisfactory to Rinuccini, who notes with displeasure that Mountgarret, though he rose from the presidential chair, did not move forward either at the reception or at the leave-taking. On the other hand, he records with evident satisfaction that his seat of red damask embossed with gold was handsomer than the president’s, and equally central.

The constitutional guardian of the Church of England wrote to the nuncio, desiring him to place implicit confidence in his agent, the Catholic Glamorgan, hoping that, though the first, this would not be the last of his letters addressed to a Papal representative, but that he might one day be able openly to declare his goodwill.† On arriving at Kilkenny, in August, 1545, Glamorgan fell into the hands of the clerical party, and when Rinuccini arrived there he found that a treaty had been already concluded. By this document the Roman Catholics were to have the public exercise of their religion absolutely uncontrolled by the Protestant Establishment, all the churches,

* Embassy in Ireland, p. 84.

† Ibid. p. 104.

with the tithes and glebes which they had at any time possessed since the outbreak, and all others not actually in Protestant hands. Catholics were to be eligible to all offices, and all penal laws against them were to be repealed. The effect of all this would have been to confine Protestantism to the towns in military occupation of the Protestants. Glamorgan covenanted with the Confederates that he should not be bound to force his Majesty's will, promising to persuade him, if possible, without letting him know the conditions agreed on. The Catholics contracted on their part to send 10,000 men to the king in England, which were to be under Glamorgan's command, and to be kept together in one body. Knowing what the king might be expected to grant, the Confederates were soon in a position to treat with the Lord Lieutenant, who offered to leave points of religion to the king, for they knew that these had already been practically decided in their favour.

It is, of course, now beyond controversy that Glamorgan had all the powers to which he pretended; that he continued after the exposure to treat with the Confederates in the king's name, who disavowed him publicly and encouraged him privately; and that the agent's loyal devotion prevented him from using the proofs which he possessed of his principal's perfidy.* The king wrote to the Pope and to Cardinal Spada as well as to the nuncio, and it was probably the first of these letters of which Glamorgan showed Rinuccini the back—'a quarter of a sheet, folded in the smallest possible compass, and directed to his Holiness thus, "Beatissimo Patri Innocentio Decimo."† Both letters were dated October 20, 1645, and expressed the fullest confidence in Glamorgan. But, publicly disowned as he was, it is not surprising that Glamorgan effected nothing, nor was his political skill on a par with his mechanical and philosophical acuteness. Belling, who had full opportunities for studying him, says he was 'levior homo, ac infirmior quam cui res tanta committi debuisset.'‡ His countess was an old love of Ormonde's, to whom she not unnaturally attributed her husband's misfortunes. Being in his company afterwards, when they were both exiles in France, she cut him dead in such a way as to attract marked attention. 'Really, madam,' said Ormonde, who never lost his presence of mind, 'this

* The whole story may be studied in Lingard, Appendix to vol. viii., note P. P. P.

† Embassy in Ireland, p. 103. The two letters are in Lingard.

‡ Vindiciæ, chap. v.

‘ would have troubled me eighteen years ago,’ and passed on to some more complaisant lady.

Besides the treaties with the viceroy and the secret agent, a third was being negotiated at Rome between the Papal Court and the queen’s resident, Sir Kenelm Digby. The articles, of which a copy was forwarded to Rinuccini, were not signed by Sir Kenelm, and were rejected by Henrietta Maria herself, but are interesting because they show what an independent Irish kingdom under Papal patronage would have been like.* So far as religion goes, they may be summarised under the following heads:—

1. The establishment of the Roman Church, with all its possessions, the monastic lands, ‘ which it is pretended ‘ were conceded to the present possessors by Cardinal Pole,’ and the sees actually in the hands of the king’s heretic subjects being reserved for the consideration of the Irish Parliament, which was to be at all times free and independent of the English Legislature.

2. The abolition of all penalties and disabilities affecting the Catholics both in England and Ireland.

3. The viceroy and other principal officials to be Catholics, and all strong places, including Dublin, to be placed in Catholic hands.

4. The king to join with the Catholics in driving out the Scots and Parliamentarians.

In short, Catholicism would have been established, and Protestantism barely tolerated, in Ireland. In consideration of the foregoing the Pope was willing to give a considerable sum of money, and the Confederacy were to send to England an army of 15,000 men ‘ under Catholic chiefs,’ who were to have unlimited power over it. The ludicrous inadequacy of the means to the end does not seem to have struck the officials of the Curia. While the nuncio waited for the original articles, which were never executed, and for Sir Kenelm Digby, who never came, the Confederates prepared to treat with Ormonde in spite of his most strenuous efforts.

On March 28, 1646, the Lord Lieutenant adjusted his terms with Muskerry and four other commissioners, Clanricarde and Digby being among the witnesses. All matters of religion were left in abeyance for the king’s decision, except that Catholics were not to be required to take the oath of supremacy. The Irish engaged to send 10,000 men to England before May 1, and the treaty was not to be published till then,

* Embassy in Ireland, p. 573.

nor at all unless the men were sent—a failure which was to release both parties from their engagements. No Irish army did go to England, and the sole result of a treaty which took a year to negotiate was a loan of 3,000*l.* to Ormonde for the defence of Dublin, and of 300 men to Digby for the defence of Scilly, whither the Prince of Wales had fled. That able and versatile but unstable politician, whose restless activity almost equalled that of Mordanto, had not yet joined the Roman communion, and Rinuccini habitually calls him the heretic Digby, in distinction from Sir Kenelm the Catholic. His object was to get the prince to Ireland, where he probably hoped to have the management of him, though Ormonde and the nuncio were both opposed to the plan. Charles had left Scilly before his arrival, and he followed him to Jersey, where he was better provided with counsellors, all of whom wished him to go to France. Foiled in his first object, Digby hurried off to Mazarin, and got 10,000 pistoles out of him, more than he had ever given to the Confederates. Thus provided and armed with both the queen's and prince's instructions, he returned to Ireland after only ten weeks' absence. Ormonde, on learning that the king was a prisoner with the Scots, and not a free agent, and that he had the entire confidence of the royal exiles, hesitated no longer to publish the peace, and the ratifications were exchanged on July 29.

The following account of 'colloquing' Digby will be interesting to many not specially concerned with Irish history:—

'A public traitor against his Majesty, though goshope (gossip) to Ormonde, now by the Lord Lieutenant is commanded for France, to work some other treason with the poor queen, by the mediation of my Lord German (*sic*), that her Majesty's favour might not be wanting in any occasion. Digby had great interest in her, did persuade her what he pleased (notwithstanding the publicity of his former treason against his Majesty); he gave out that he was agent from the Confederates and the rest of the kingdom of Ireland by royal consent, whereby he entered unto the favour of Cardinal Masarine, Prince Counsellor to the Christian Majesty, who was highly devoted to the Confederate Catholics of Ireland, in pursuance whereof made up the matter of 10,000*l.* sterling, to be given to the said Catholics, as a gratitude of their Catholic intentions, to enable them in their holy war, and thinking Digby to be truly and really agent, commanded him to carry the said sum of money to the Confederates as aforesaid. Digby . . . landed in Waterford with the money, where presently commanded carriage, with the said money, to Dublin to Ormonde, himself departing from thence to Kilkenny, where arriving was bountifully entertained, and more like a prince than a subject received by the Supreme Council such smiles and jollity showed for his safe arrival, that a dull man might understand that what was done against Clanmor-

gan's (*sic*) person and commission by the surmises of this Digby was not only grateful unto them, but their proper act. Likely this man had some letters from Cardinal Masarine to the Supreme Council, setting forth his donation, for what intencion bestowed, and promising future more ample gifts, if the present well employed, but none such came to light, but rather money and letters were shifted between them and Ormonde.*

The author has no language too strong to abuse those who thought well of Digby, and even considered his services more important than those of Owen Roe.

The peace was proclaimed at Kilkenny in spite of the clergy, who meditated an interdict; but at Waterford and Limerick Ulster was unable to do his office, and at the latter place narrowly escaped death at the hands of the mob. The Limerick rioters were headed by one Dominick Fanning, who seems to have been an impracticable agitator such as Ireland still knows only too well. Fanning afterwards perished miserably, having surrendered to Ireton's soldiers after he had been refused food or shelter by his own wife. Loyalists of both creeds were willing to accept Ormonde's treaty; but the clerical party had been emboldened by a great military success, and were less inclined to moderation than at any former time. On June 5, 1646, Owen Roe had defeated Monroe at Benburb, on the Blackwater, six or seven miles from the spot where his uncle had overthrown Marshal Bagenal forty-eight years before. The Scots, who were superior in all arms, had the wind in their favour; but O'Neill restrained his men until the evening, when it had fallen a good deal—a remarkable phenomenon, which the nuncio does not fail to note as miraculous. Before the final charge the general made a short speech to his men, reminding them of their wrongs, of their ancient lineage, and of their just cause. 'Your word,' he said in conclusion, 'is *Sancta Maria*; and so in the name of 'the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, advance, and give not 'fire till you are within pike-length.'†

The author of the 'Aphorismical Discovery' gives a long oration, stuffed with allusions to Cain and Abel, Plutarch and Polybius, Hannibal and Scipio, the Emperor Gratian and the Maccabees, which we may be sure are his own and not his hero's.‡ The Irish all confessed before the battle, and the nuncio observes that certificates of confession were furnished by O'Neill to the General of the Observantines,§ who accom-

* Gilbert, p. 118.

† Gilbert, p. 111.

‡ Warr of Ireland, p. 47.

§ Embassy in Ireland, p. 174.

panied the army. Monroe thought the 'Lord of Hosts' had a controversy with us to rub shame on our faces, as on 'other armies, till once we shall be humbled,' &c. The British officer, who is not given to the supernatural, thinks the Scots were tired with long marches, and moreover used broad-headed pikes, 'which are the worst in the world. Withal, to my own knowledge, the soldiers, I mean some that were not strong enough in the British army for his pike in a windy day, would cut off a foot, and some two, of their pikes—which is a damned thing to be suffered.' Besides all this the Scots did not expect the Irish to fight, and security makes carelessness. Monroe's intention, had he won the battle, was to have marched to Kilkenny and dictated terms there, and Rinuccini unjustly suspected that he had a secret understanding with Ormonde. O'Neill withdrew into Cavan to watch the progress of the obnoxious treaty, and the greatest victory ever gained by an Irish general in Ireland had scarcely any permanent consequences.

During the long negotiations between Ormonde and the Confederates, Inchiquin had been acting in Munster with little reference to either of the nominal governments. As Lord President in virtue of a parliamentary commission, he turned all Irishmen out of Cork, Kinsale, and Youghal—he an O'Brien—and Muskerry was sent to check him, a task which he performed unwillingly. Rinuccini followed the army, and heard the news of Benburb at Limerick. Returning to Waterford he held a synod, in which all who adhered to Ormonde's peace were declared perjurers and worthy of excommunication.* During the nuncio's absence, Ormonde was invited to Kilkenny, and marched southward with 2,000 men. He made no political impression, and, learning that Preston and O'Neill were secretly combining to intercept him,† was glad to reach Dublin by a hurried flight, and soon afterwards sent commissioners to treat with the Parliament.

Rinuccini re-entered Kilkenny in triumph, and O'Neill encamped near the town. Most of the Council were imprisoned, and a new one was appointed from among the nuncio's adherents, consisting of four priests and eight laymen,‡ who immediately chose him president, and took an oath pledging themselves to procure the full establishment of their Church in Ireland. Rinuccini appointed Glamorgan general of Munster in place of Muskerry,

* Brennan's 'Ecclesiastical History,' p. 459. Ed. 1864.

† Castlehaven, p. 68.

‡ Spicilegium Ossoriense, 2nd series, p. 28.

intending to make him Lord Lieutenant afterwards, and the poor man boasted that he would soon drive Inchiquin out of all the sea-ports. Glamorgan also took what was in fact an oath of allegiance to the Holy See and the nuncio, the only witnesses being Nicholas French, Bishop of Ferns, Ormonde's rancorous foe and libeller, and Robert Nugent, Provincial of the Jesuits.*

After many delays the nuncio succeeded in getting the combined armies to march against Dublin; but the jealousy between Preston and O'Neill continued unabated, and Rinuccini did not improve matters by dividing the funds at his disposal very unequally between the two generals. Ormonde devastated the environs of the capital, to make it harder for his assailants to live. Lady Ormonde and other ladies of rank carried baskets of earth to encourage the workmen who were employed to strengthen the fortifications. The Lord Lieutenant had raised about 27,000*l.* on his own estate, and his resources were exhausted. O'Neill and Preston had 16,000 foot and 1,600 horse, and, had they been on good terms, might have taken Dublin by a sudden attack. But they were bold only in words, demanding the surrender of Dublin and Drogheda, but taking no steps to enforce the demand. Ormonde could neither grant their terms nor resist their arms, and he sought help in vain from the Ulster Scots. He decided at last to admit a body of parliamentary troops who had arrived in Dublin Bay, a course to which he was partly forced by the clamour of the citizens. No sooner did the news reach the Irish camp than O'Neill collected his men by firing a cannon, threw an extempore bridge over the Liffey at Leixlip, and withdrew through Westmeath into Connaught. The Ulster leader always acted independently of the Council, and showed very little real respect to the nuncio, who distrusted him profoundly. But he allowed his soldiers to call themselves the Pope's and the Church's army. 'The result is,' says Rinuccini, 'that whenever the Ulster soldiers (barbarous enough by nature, although good Catholics) perform any act of cruelty or robbery, the sufferers execrate his Holiness and me, and curse the clergy whom they consider the patrons of this army.'†

The Commissioners in charge of the small parliamentary force, the mere news of whose arrival was enough to disperse the Irish army, were unable to come to terms with Ormonde, and retired into Ulster, where the Scots denied their men

* Carte.

† Embassy in Ireland, p. 283.

admission into Belfast or Carrickfergus. Clanricarde tried to bring about an understanding between Ormonde and Preston, but found the latter so untrustworthy that he forgot his accustomed serenity and called him traitor. Proud, quarrelsome, and incapable of holding his tongue or concealing his emotions, Preston's religious feeling or superstitious fear kept him in subjection to the nuncio, and he was again induced to act nominally as O'Neill's colleague. Having exhausted every military and financial expedient, Ormonde was forced to make the best terms he could with the Parliament, admitted their garrison, and on July 28, 1647, 'having left the regalia to be delivered to the Commissioners, went on board Captain Matthew Wood's frigate, attended by the prayers of the distressed clergy, great numbers of whom, with their wives and children, had been kept from perishing through want by his and his lady's bounty, and landed on August 2 at Bristol.'*

After the siege of Dublin had been abandoned, the Confederate General Assembly, consisting of about 300 members, met at Kilkenny. 'The session commenced,' says Rinuccini, 'with all those signs of discord and intrigues which generally reign in such meetings, and consequently there was great danger of rupture between the clergy and their adherents, and the Ormondists who promoted or treated of peace.'† The old Council were released with tempers not improved. Belling declared that the Pope had told him in Wadding's presence that the Irish might as well make what terms they could, and put up with a secret, if unable to obtain a public, guarantee for religion. The nuncio said that if the Pope had so spoken it was owing to Belling's false report, and that, since he had had Scarampi's better information, he had given totally different orders. While constantly professing that the Catholic cause was the king's, Rinuccini would certainly have liked to place Ireland under the Pope's protection. In this he had all the Irish nobility against him. There was also a French party in constant communication with the Prince of Wales. The agents of the Most Christian and of the Catholic King were naturally opposed, and both more anxious to secure Irish recruits for their masters' armies than to increase his Holiness's temporal power. Rinuccini could not even get the old question of investitures decided in the Pope's favour; for the Irish laity, led by Glamorgan, pertinaciously refused to do anything derogatory to the royal authority.

* Carte, end of book iv.

† Embassy in Ireland, p. 244.

Inchiquin was practically unopposed all this time, for the Irish army declined Glamorgan as a commander because he was an Englishman. Many of the officers were Muskerry's connexions, and took his part, though the nuncio hated him for his partiality to Ormonde. Warned of Rinuccini's designs against him, Muskerry hurried to Clonmel, where the adjourned session was being held. The nuncionists declared he should not take part in a discussion in which he was personally interested. Professing to fear, perhaps really fearing, violence, he hurried off to the army, the larger half of which received him gladly and deposed Glamorgan. Next day the restored general occupied Clonmel with his troops, and, according to Belling, showed his magnanimity by refusing to punish opponents.* Neither by Glamorgan nor by Muskerry was any effectual resistance offered to Inchiquin's bloody progress.

Relieved from the incubus of O'Neill's alliance, and more inclined to fight him than the Parliamentarians, Preston lay inactive in the Pale with 8,000 men, and on August 6, 1647, allowed himself to be attacked near Trim by Michael Jones and 2,000 of the garrison of Dublin. Preston managed to get his horse into a narrow lane, and his foot into some very tall corn, while he posted his reserves too far off, and in such a way that they could not see the front. Jones took full advantage of these blunders, and the Puritan veterans, used to victory and believing themselves the favourites of Heaven, advanced steadily to the attack. A butchery rather than a battle followed, nearly half the Irish army being killed, while Jones's loss was trifling. The principal resistance was offered by a regiment of Scots islemen, under a Glengarry, who refused quarter and fell fighting bravely. Over 100 officers, all the colours, baggage, and stores remained in the victors' hands, and their neighbours forced the Catholic citizens of Dublin to join in the illuminations. Jones refused to make anything like a triumphal entry, lest it might look like taking credit for what was due to God alone.

A few weeks after Preston's defeat Inchiquin took Cashel by storm, and atrocities were committed which give the affair a bad eminence even in this dreadful war. Rinuccini was at Galway, and feared to have his retreat cut off; indeed he thought it probable that Kilkenny itself might fall. Suddenly the victorious Inchiquin turned back into Cork, and overthrew Taaffe's division at Knockinoss. Owen O'Neill remained the only defence of the Confederates, and made his dispositions

* *Vindiciæ*, chap. v.

so well that Jones was closely shut up in Dublin for many months, during which the citizens could sometimes see 200 Irish watch-fires at once. After his victories Inchiquin took offence at some proceedings of the Parliamentary Lord Lieutenant Lord Lisle, or he may have been really alarmed at the lengths to which the party were going; at all events he began a correspondence with Ormonde.

For a moment the Confederates had breathing space, but they feared their protector almost as much as their assailants, and O'Neill was even suspected of wishing to make himself king. So bitter was the feeling that he refused to attend the assembly, saying that his life would not be safe there.* The prevailing distrust was much increased by the appearance of a book called '*Disputatio Apologetica*,' which had been printed at Lisbon by Cornelius Mahon, an Irish Jesuit. Mahon advised his countrymen to drive out all the English, whether heretics or not, and to elect an Irish Catholic king, Owen Roe being of course the only possible candidate. The gentry, and especially the lawyers, of the Pale had never at any time dreamed of disputing the sovereignty of the English Crown, and regarded Mahon's doctrine as rank treason. Rinuccini, who could never respect, nor perhaps even understand, the opinions of others, says their anger really arose from the fear of losing the monastic lands. The '*Disputatio*' was burned by the hangman at Kilkenny, and every procurable copy destroyed by order of the Council, who employed the renowned Peter Walsh to preach nine sermons in refutation of it. John of Portugal, the first king of the restored monarchy, severely prohibited the work as derogatory to a brother sovereign, and it probably contributed a good deal to the confusion of the nuncio's plans.† When he was at Galway, Clanricarde, who was above all things loyal, studiously avoided paying him any attention, and he thought it prudent to abstain from presenting a complimentary brief which the Pope had sent to the Western chief.‡

The year 1648 was miserably occupied by the struggles of the expiring Confederacy. Much as he had distrusted O'Neill, Rinuccini had now no praise too high for him, and indeed he was his only support. The Council determined to treat with

* Embassy in Ireland, p. 339.

† Gilbert, pp. 667, 739; Embassy in Ireland, p. 321; Walsh's '*Remonstrance*,' 2nd part, section 22; Clarendon, '*Ireland*,' p. 55.

‡ Embassy in Ireland, p. 323; *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 2nd series, p. 23.

Inchiquin, and to accept his aid against the Parliament, whereupon the nuncio excommunicated all who should receive the truce, and laid an interdict on the towns and districts favourable to the Confederates. Glamorgan left the country in company with Leyburn, an English priest in Henrietta Maria's service who had long been a thorn in Rinuccini's side; but the absence of two troublesome people did not make peace. Some of the clergy even had the courage to oppose the Pope's representative. Thus John Bourke, Archbishop of Tuam, who probably sympathised with Clanricarde as head of his clan, broke into the collegiate church at Galway through a hole in the roof, and celebrated mass in defiance of the nuncio, who was practically besieged in the town and unable to communicate with Kilkenny. In the latter town great congregations frequented St. Canice's to hear Peter Walsh, whose Franciscan cord hung somewhat loosely about him, thundering against the interdict.* There was even an attempt to obtain a decision of the Sorbonne against its validity. Rinuccini proposed that Walsh should be called before the Inquisition. The aged Bishop of Ossory assumed an independent position, and some other bishops were no less hostile to the nuncio. The Provincials of the barefooted Carmelites and of the Jesuits counselled disobedience. The disciples of Loyola have not seldom held that they best performed their peculiar office of defending the Papacy by declining to obey the Pope's orders, and a mere nuncio could expect no better treatment. Preston, whose hatred for O'Neill at last overcame his respect or fear of the nuncio, declared that he considered his censures invalid, and that he would pursue the Ulster general until one or other fell in single combat. Ten peers and many important gentlemen subscribed a sworn undertaking to adhere to the original oath of association, and to suppress, at the hazard of their lives, all who stood in arms to oppose it. They appealed formally to his Holiness against 'the excommunication issued forth by the Lord Nuncio and four bishops.'† Ormonde landed once more at Cork, and was practically appointed Dictator by all but the Ulster army, which was too weak to offer serious opposition, even though swollen by many deserters from Preston. O'Neill himself made polite overtures to Ormonde, professing to believe that he was ready to give full satisfaction to the Irish Catholics, and that his goodwill had hitherto been neutralised by his want of the necessary powers.

* Gilbert, p. 274.

† Walsh's 'Remonstrance,' First Appendix.

The Lord Lieutenant's answer was cautious and cool, and he does not fail to notice that 'the nuncio is a foreigner.' * Then came the execution of the king, and Rinuccini was glad to escape from a country where he had met with nothing but disasters which even his admirers can hardly say he did anything to avert.

Early in March, 1649, the very 'San Pietro,' from the omen of whose name the nuncio had gathered such comfort three years and a half before, carried him, defeated and discredited, to the coast of Normandy. From Orleans he wrote to the General of the Jesuits, complaining of Malone, the Irish Provincial, and summing up the situation thus:—

'The Catholic Confederation is under the power of a heretic; Munster is in possession of a Calvinist; the Protestant bishops and parish priests are already preparing to take possession of the ecclesiastical income. If these continue, the kingdom will be lost, and on Father Malone and his associates will lie the greater share of the blame.'

In another place he says:—

'It may be by the will of God that a people Catholic only in name, and so irreverent towards the Church, should feel the thunderbolt of the Holy See, and draw upon themselves the anger which is the meed of the scorner.'

Poor Ireland! it is hard that this, of all crimes, should be laid to her charge.

Scarcely had Rinuccini departed when the coming giant's shadow was cast over the land. Too late the voice of controversy was hushed; a hasty and imperfect union of discordant elements was powerless to stay Cromwell's iron hand; and to the last a large section of the clergy hated their rebellious flocks more even than the Puritan conqueror. O'Neill was spared by an early death from witnessing the ruin of all his hopes. In the face of every discouragement Ormonde supported the falling cause to the latest possible moment, and then withdrew to await better times, leaving his brave wife in Ireland to collect what the victor's clemency allowed her to save from the wreck of a great estate. Clanricarde remained to see Ireland completely subdued, and died young in England, unmolested by the wise Protector, whom he left apparently at the height of his power. The restless Inchiquin escaped to the Continent, where, among many strange adventures, he was captured by Algerine pirates, and released at the instance of

* Gilbert, pp. 751, 754, 756.

the English Council of State, from whose arms he had fled. Broghill prepared after the death of Charles I. to espouse his son's cause, but was gained over by Cromwell, became his trusted lieutenant, and lived to play the part of an Irish Monk. Monroe, who had by marriage acquired a considerable estate in Ulster, was treacherously given up by his own officers to Monk in 1647, and spent five years in the Tower under what was practically a sentence of death. It is said that he was there frequently consulted by the Protector. Afterwards he was allowed to compound for life and property, and died in bed at his house in Down near the end of Charles II.'s reign. Preston to some extent redeemed his fame by a gallant defence of Waterford against Ireton; he died abroad soon after the Restoration.

Lord Clarendon was of opinion that in dealing with the Irish rebellion Rome had forgotten her accustomed cunning. If this be the case—and certainly nothing could have been more unsuccessful than her policy—the chief blame must fall upon Rinuccini, who had great discretionary powers. Being very overbearing and too careful of his official dignity, he had not the suppleness necessary for a diplomatist. Everywhere he was inclined to stand upon his strict rights, forgetting the extraordinary country to which he was accredited. He made no friends, for he trusted no one. Not a single layman had his good word for long, and even of clergymen he changed his opinion, according as they opposed or supported him on particular occasions. He could not brook independence among laymen or ecclesiastics. At Rome he was accused, perhaps wrongly, of personal ambition, but of personal vanity he certainly had a full share. Like Bacon and some other eminent men, he thoroughly enjoyed the outward trappings of his office, and there is something almost oriental in the importance he gives to points of etiquette. It evidently gave him intense pleasure when a doge advanced four steps to meet him, when his chair in a council of state was more ornate than the president's, when noblemen came four miles out of town to greet him, when devout citizens carried a canopy over his head on a wet day. On the other hand, the least appearance of neglect is noted with nervous minuteness. Evidently a very bad judge of political forces, he was elated by transient successes, and learned little wisdom from rebuffs and failures. His superstition caused him to register coincidences and omens with a childish particularity. With all this he was a thoroughly pious and sincere priest, and took great pains to use his patronage well. He was careless of money, and freely

spent all that he had to further his mission. A model archbishop, he lacked almost every qualification for a statesman.

Ormonde was a born politician, thoroughly suited for the part which he had to play. He began by bearding Strafford, but with characteristic caution kept the law on his side, even when he appeared to be transported with anger. To be loyal was his birthright, the distinguishing mark of a long line of able and magnificent ancestors. But he was no mere cavalier partisan, the conception of law being quite as familiar to him as that of royalty. He was a sincere Anglican of Laud's school; and that prelate, who has been accused of undue leaning to Rome, is entitled to the credit of so distinguished a pupil. Men urged him to play the part of Henry IV., and not lose Ireland for a mass,* but he never wavered. Rinuccini tried to shake his resolution, but with little hopes of success, for he knew that Ormonde had declared it impossible to believe in transubstantiation or in the Papal supremacy—matters which have at all times presented difficulties to many worthy men. Peter Walsh, whom he protected and sheltered in his own house, never dared to attempt his conversion until James II. was on the throne, and he received an answer which did not encourage him to repeat the experiment. Ormonde was thoroughly tolerant for his time, but never willing to place his own church in a position of inferiority to that of Rome. Acting up to the traditions of his family, he made the English connexion a first principle in Irish politics, and this is the real reason why he was so much hated by the forerunners of the modern nationalists. The king to whom he felt loyal was the King of England, and he preferred even the rebel Parliament to an Irish state under Papal patronage. He spent his last shilling in maintaining these views. Ormonde had extraordinary presence of mind, and never forgot himself in any way; he was perhaps rather cold. A very fair general, though not brought up to war, he kept an army together under the most desperate circumstances, and was victorious against ordinary enemies. To say that he was overthrown by Jones and Cromwell is only to say that he had not the genius to make raw levies, ill paid and disunited, equal to the best troops in Europe. Facts forbid us to call him, with Bishop French, the 'unkind deserter of true friends.' But neither are we obliged to accept Carte's panegyric unreservedly. He was not a hero, but he was an extremely able and serviceable man. It cannot be fairly said that he ever

* *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 1st series, p. 370.

postponed his duty to that keen sense of interest which he certainly possessed. Historical characters have sometimes been ticketed, in Homeric fashion, as the contentious man, the politic man, and so forth. Ormonde might be distinguished as the patient man, and for a statesman it is not the worst title to fame.

Owen Roe O'Neill, who in many ways resembled his uncle Tyrone, had nothing of the traditional Irishman about him. Haughty and reticent even to moroseness, it was impossible to cajole him, and his nephew Daniel, one of the cleverest intriguers of the time, was obliged to confess himself baffled by 'that subtle man.' Though he could never be induced to bind himself rashly, it is allowed by general consent that his promises were sacred. When it suited his purpose, he was ready to treat with Ormonde, and invariably addressed him with the respect due to the king's lieutenant; but he was never his tool. The treacherous attempt to cut off the marquis between Kilkenny and Dublin forms no exception, for he had nothing to say to inviting him, and had a right to take advantage of the opportunity. Neither had he any objection to be on friendly terms with Jones or Monk, or even to help them, in consideration of indispensable supplies. In all such negotiations his immediate aim was to keep his army together; but it is not easy to say what was the ultimate object of his ambition. Indiscreet partisans might present him a kingly crown, but he was far too wise a man not to refuse it. Ormonde, and Clarendon who wrote under his influence, thought O'Neill had some hopes of making a separate peace, regaining the estate of his ancestors, and obtaining religious liberty for his immediate adherents. To look upon Ulster as a separate principality, and to be prince in it, had been the policy of his uncle and of his great-uncle Shane, if indeed Tyrone and his nephew were really the descendants of Con Bacagh and not of the Dundalk blacksmith. Others suppose that O'Neill lived in hope of foreign intervention, or that he expected, at the worst, to carry an unbroken army into the Spanish service. Of his talents as a general there can be no doubt; and though the progress of his army was said to resemble that of a horde of Tartars, this must in fairness be attributed to the wild Ulster pikemen rather than to their leader. Having no regular supplies, he was obliged to live on the country, and could not afford to emulate the illustrious captor of Drogheda, who hanged men for stealing chickens. O'Neill's letters, of which a great number remain, are those of a soldier and a gentleman. Had he lived he might have prolonged the war, though he could

hardly have altered the event. He must always have a high place among those who have fought bravely in a hopeless cause. It is possible to take the Parliamentary side in the great quarrel, and yet to sympathise with those who struggled vainly for what, after all, was civil and religious liberty. The men of that age could not receive the truth; but we should be able to see over the mist of prejudice and fanaticism which grossly closed them in.

If any lesson is to be learned from history, that of the Irish rebellion teaches us that our two islands cannot permanently maintain a separate political existence. Supreme power must reside somewhere, and Ireland has never been in a position to keep order for herself. From the arrival of the first man-at-arms under Henry II. to the final conquest under William III. successive waves of invasion brought each its tribute of dissension to the ill-fated land. Religious differences were added; but they did not obliterate the distinctions of race, and those adhering to the old faith have ever been divided among themselves. In the days of Rinuccini, at the time of the Remonstrance, during the discussion of the Veto, at the present day, the priests have always taken the popular side, sometimes leading, sometimes following, the people; while the aristocracy have been loyal subjects first and Irish Catholics afterwards, and have in consequence lost all control over the masses. It is the overpowering strength of Great Britain which keeps the lesser island from becoming a prey to anarchy. For good or evil, let us hope for good, the destinies of the two countries are indissolubly united.

Our readers will at once perceive the motive which has led us to revert to this passage of our history at the present time. We have been informed by high authority amongst the partisans of Home Rule that their ultimate object is an Irish Parliament, which would be, not, like the Irish Parliament of 1782, a Protestant body, but on the contrary an assembly four-fifths Roman Catholic. It is needless to point out the consequence of a Catholic House of Commons in Ireland opposed to a Protestant House of Peers and a Protestant British Parliament. Such a House of Commons would be in great measure returned by the priests, and subservient to them, as they are subservient to their Church. Home Rule, therefore, means simply Catholic rule in Ireland.

ART. VII.—*Lectures and Essays.* By the late WILLIAM KINGDON CLIFFORD, F.R.S. Edited by LESLIE STEPHEN and FREDERICK POLLOCK, with an Introduction by F. POLLOCK. Two vols. 8vo. London: 1879.

THE volumes now before us are extremely welcome. Not only is their intrinsic interest great, but their interest accidentally is still greater. The late Professor Clifford was a very remarkable man, and he was remarkable for two reasons—first, for the genuine eminence that was due to his own genius; secondly, for the imputed eminence that was due to the admiration of his friends. For the first of these we entertain all respect, and we shall speak of it in respectful terms; but we do it no wrong if we say that it is altogether dwarfed by the second. Professor Clifford has grave claims on our attention, and not only does this view of him in no way detract from these, but in some ways it very largely increases them. If we study a man because we think him really great, and desire to understand the exact quality of his greatness, we shall, without doubt, be doing a very important thing. But if we study a man mainly because he has been thought great by others, we may be doing a thing that is no less important, although in a somewhat different way. If the interest in the former case is more intense, in the latter it is more extended. A genius, as a genius, represents himself, and nothing more than himself. A man, as thought to be a genius, represents the judgments of those who have thought him one; and the less solid the ground that this opinion rests upon, the more significant does the opinion itself become. We cannot be sure, for instance, that a man is a judge of poetry because he takes pleasure in reading ‘Hamlet;’ but we can be sure he is not a judge of poetry if he takes pleasure in reading Martin Tupper. If we pass from poetry to philosophy, the matter is yet plainer. We may assent dutifully to profound truths without being ourselves profound; but we shall not emphatically endorse superficial falsehoods without being ourselves ignorant and superficial.

Let us now pass at once to Professor Clifford, and see the application of these remarks to him. His most obvious claim to notice was his great power as a specialist. He was a mathematician of a very high order, and, speaking merely of the outward events of his life, it was as a mathematician that his career was successful. But besides his mathematical powers he had a wide and accurate grasp of physical science generally; and he had a singular faculty, also, of imparting clearly

whatever he knew clearly. In this way he became, very early in life, a powerful and prominent figure in the world of scientific thinkers; nor, as we read his lectures, and reflect upon his personal character, can we at all wonder at the high position he occupied. But this position could by no means content him; he could not but look further. The scientific world, as compared with the world in general, was really, he saw, only a limited *coterie*, limited not only in point of numbers, but in point of the questions with which it was supposed to busy itself. How absorbing and vast these questions were no man knew better than Clifford, but he knew also that there was another question beyond them, to which they were all subordinate. This, in his own language, was the question of 'right and wrong;' or, in other words, the question of how to live and what ends to live for. This was the only enquiry, he said, that concerned all of us; and it was further the supreme concern of each. Man is born to act, not to think and to know. Know and think he must, and he must know and think accurately; but this as a means only, not as an end. 'Our interest,' Clifford said, in speaking of the physical sciences, 'lies with so much of the past as may serve to guide our actions in the present, and to intensify our pious allegiance to the fathers who have gone before us and the brethren who are with us; and our interest lies with so much of the future as we may hope will be appreciably affected by our good actions now. Beyond that, as it seems to me, we do not know, and we ought not to care.' It was his ambition, therefore, to emerge from the domain of specialists, and to become a power in the domain of practical life. He was not content with being an instructor of students; he proposed also to be a leader of men. Nor was his ambition here of at all a limited nature. He saw the disorder of the world, its painful perplexities of thought, and its chaos of conflicting motives, and he sought in the midst of this to inaugurate a new order, and by entirely new means. His schemes were co-extensive with the whole of human life. There was no force of passion or of faith, of self-approval or contrition, of joy or pain, with which he did not consider himself well qualified to deal. This assertion may at first sight appear startling; and doubtless, made bluntly, it would have startled Clifford himself. But we shall see very shortly that it is neither more nor less than the truth.

It must not be supposed, however, that Clifford's practical schemes and teachings at all superseded his more special studies. The former, as he conceived them, were but the

fulfilment of the latter, and it was mainly the latter, he thought, that made him fit for the former. He did not say that scientific knowledge was inferior to practical knowledge, but that practical knowledge must be made scientific. 'What,' he asked, 'is the domain of science? It is all possible human knowledge which can rightly be used to guide human conduct.' And when knowledge, with a view to such guidance, had been enlarged and sifted by scientific methods, a complete revolution, he conceived, would take place in the whole of it. In this revolution, as we have said already, he aspired to play a prominent part. What was the part he actually did play in it is what we propose to enquire in the present article. Of his merits as a professor we shall say but little. We shall confine ourselves to considering how far those merits had fitted him to be an instructor of the world in general.

Now, our own verdict is that they had not fitted him at all; nor should we consider him in this capacity as worth discussion if it were not for one reason. That reason is the reverence that has been given him in England by those of his own way of thinking; and these are none other than that school of science and of progress which at the present moment has secured the ear of the world. If, therefore, in Clifford's writings we find but little of the sort of wisdom we are speaking of, we shall find what has passed for wisdom with those who pass for wise; so much so that in the volumes now before us we seem to have a reflection of the state of philosophical knowledge and practical sagacity amongst those who conceive themselves now to be the high-priests of humanity and the directors of human destiny. Similar reflections may, of course, be found elsewhere; but we doubt if we can find any so complete, and we may add so flattering, as here. Clifford was in every way fitted to be a representative man, in virtue alike of his strength and weakness, his breadth and narrowness, and also of his character, his education, and the general tenor of his life.

It is to this last subject that we now propose to proceed, as, in considering his general teaching, it will throw much light on the matter. It is his own observation that one of the chief steps in psychology was 'Hartley's idea of *mental chemistry*.' We are ourselves about to act on an idea somewhat similar, and apply to Clifford's life what we may call biographical chemistry. We will explain our meaning further. The practical teachings of Clifford, like those of his school in general, have been given to the world as the first fruits of a new era, and they are supposed to be based on reformed methods of study. We, on the contrary, conceive their origin

to be entirely different. We conceive them to have nothing to do with reformed methods, or to be at best connected with them in a very secondary way. We believe them to belong almost exclusively to the old order of things, and that the true explanation of them is to be found not in the matured theories of their advocates, but in their early education, the circumstances of their lives, and the moral atmosphere they breathed while their characters were in the process of formation. We believe, in other words, that these teachings represent not the voice of science, but the voice of a certain section of society, remarkable in practical matters for amiability, simplicity, and prejudice, and, above all, for religious feeling. Nothing, we think, would show this more clearly than the examination we are about to make of the life of Professor Clifford. This, for our present purpose, need be only a very simple one, and Mr. Pollock's brief memoir will supply us with nearly all the materials that are requisite.

William Kingdon Clifford was born in 1845 at Exeter, where his father for a time was one of the chief booksellers, and afterwards, on retiring from business, a respected and active magistrate. The first fifteen years of his life Clifford passed in his native city, and received the best education that its schools could offer him. Towards the end of this period he showed marked signs of ability. He distinguished himself in the university local examinations, and in 1860 he went to King's College, London. It was here that, for the first time, his special powers developed themselves, and he was recognised as a mathematical genius of peculiar promise. He remained at King's College for three years. Towards the end of that period he went up to Cambridge, and gained a minor scholarship at Trinity College, and in 1863, at the age of eighteen, he began his life there. Here he gained a reputation of a somewhat varied kind, not only as a thinker and a student, but also as a successful gymnast; and his biographer tells us of him that, of all public testimonies to his merits at Cambridge, a paragraph in 'Bell's Life' was the one that pleased him best. The regular course of reading that is marked out for undergraduates seemed to him at once narrow and narrowing, and, though anxious for a good degree, he could not resist endangering his best prospects by straying in search of knowledge far beyond the appointed boundaries. In this way, from an academical point of view, much of his time was completely wasted; and yet such were his talents and so great his powers of work, that at the end of his fourth year he came out Second Wrangler, and was also second Smith's prizeman. In

the next year, when he was but twenty-three, he was elected a fellow of his college. Two years later he took part in the English Eclipse expedition, and saw something of foreign travel, both in its pleasures and its hardships. Another year passed, and he was elected Professor of Applied Mathematics at University College, London. He was now only twenty-six, and in another three years, when he was still short of thirty, he was elected Fellow of the Royal Society. In the following year he married, and, so far as we can presume to judge, all life seemed to be growing bright for him. But the promises of the future were too soon to be blighted. His assiduous work, in which he never spared himself, had been too much for even strength like his, and he had hardly been married a year before signs of pulmonary disease were observed in him. So grave did these appear that he was obliged, though with extreme reluctance, to accept a six months' holiday, which he spent in Algiers and in the south of Spain. This rest, for the time, was of great benefit to him. He returned to England much recruited, and, though still considered by the doctors extremely delicate, he continued for a year and a half longer a life of intellectual labour. By-and-by, however, a relapse came. He was working hard at the time, and he still refused to spare himself. At the same juncture his father died, and the shock of this loss was a fresh and severe strain. Every circumstance seemed to combine against him, and his own restless mind, which was more than ever occupied with work, was his worst enemy. His weakened system could bear up no longer; and his doctors now warned him that he was in a state of imminent danger, and that he must at once leave England. In the April of 1878 he and his wife started for the Mediterranean. Four months of travel again brought their benefit, and the invalid returned in August seemingly much better. The improvement, however, did not last long. In a few weeks he again overtried himself, a relapse took place, and 'from that day,' says his biographer, 'the fight was a losing one.' All that could be done for him his friends did, and through their solicitous counsels, and, we believe, attended by some of them, he again tried what a milder climate could do for him, and sailed for Madeira at the beginning of last year. But it was all in vain. He gained nothing more than a two months' reprieve, and on March 3, 1879, he died.

Such is the rough sketch of Clifford's life in its main outer incidents. His inward history we shall consider presently, but there is a certain tribute due to him which we shall first

pause to pay. If we think of Clifford himself as a private character, the principal task before us is a singularly ungrateful one. It is a task that will consist of entirely adverse criticism. Clifford, as in a few moments we shall have to look at him, will be not a private character, but a public teacher, and we shall see him in this capacity as one of the bitterest and most unflinching opponents of everything that in general the world calls religion—a contemptuous and obtrusive denier of God, of soul, and of immortality. And we shall further see him as replacing the denied doctrines by others which, tried by his own canons, we shall show to be entirely baseless. But just as his merits as a man must not blind us to his faults as a teacher, so his faults as a teacher must not blind us to his merits as a man. The two in his case seem eminently separable, and we desire as distinctly as we can to separate them. Nor must anything we shall say presently about the former be held to indicate that we doubt or forget the latter. Of a man's intellectual eminence there is perhaps no worse judge than an admiring and affectionate friend. To a man's personal excellence there can be no better witness. And as to Clifford's private character, it seems that all his friends were agreed. Rarely, we fear, can it fall to the lot of anyone to inspire an intimate circle with such a deep and tender regard as Clifford did. Clifford's own circle indeed, as his biographer tells us, was composed for the most part of what we may call kindred spirits, and his extreme opinions, which he never disguised from anyone, could be no offence to them, as to outsiders they could not fail to be. But even such outsiders were partly disarmed of their anger by the truthfulness and the severe simplicity of this blunt atheist. Mr. F. Pollock's memoir is not remarkable as a piece of biographical art, nor do the somewhat puerile profundities and the occasional fine writing he indulges in enable us to think highly of his philosophical or literary powers. But the affection he expresses for his friend is a fact of real significance, and the details of that friend's character, which he gives us with a touching tenderness, we may receive with implicit confidence—a confidence all the greater because the language used is so moderate, and no attempt is made to disguise certain slight imperfections. Thus both in manner and dress we gather that Clifford was generally uncouth and careless, and his laughter especially knew no conventional restraints. His humour, too, would seem to have been somewhat cumbrous, though much admired by the society in which he lived. Such defects as these, however, are only trifles, and by many of his friends they were probably thought merits.

What we wish here to dwell upon are his deeper and rarer qualities. As a friend he was genial and unselfish, and, above all, constant and genuine. Even his enmities and disapprovals were softened by a natural charity, and, if he met his worst foe suddenly, his first impulse would have been to shake hands with him. As a companion he had many endearing qualities. In his eagerness in his own pursuits there was something catching. He forced his friends to share it, as if by some happy magic, whilst he was equally ready himself to feel with them in turn. 'But the real expression,' says Mr. Pollock, 'of Clifford's varied and fascinating qualities was in his whole daily life and conversation, perceived and felt at every moment in his words and looks, and for that very reason impossible to describe.' If we may be allowed to cite a valuable private testimony in corroboration of this remark, we may add that so keen an observer as Lord Houghton has, in our hearing, spoken of Clifford in almost exactly the same words; and after two such witnesses we need seek for no other. Truthful, affectionate, laborious, self-denying, and devoted, the moral life of this professing atheist may indeed put to shame not a few professing Christians. Mr. Pollock says further that it is a 'rebuke' to the defenders of Christianity. This, however, is a very different statement, and, as we shall see presently, an altogether untrue one.

Of Clifford's special abilities as a mathematician and a professor this is not the place to speak critically. To do so would be an impertinence in every sense of the word; the more so, since, to use Mr. Pollock's language, 'the task will [probably] be undertaken shortly by competent hands, and in a more appropriate connexion.' All praise and honour, however, that the most partial judges can award him, we may here take for granted. Our present province lies wholly apart from theirs; and no criticisms of ours will gainsay their sentence.

Let us now return to what is of more direct concern to us. Let us return to Clifford as a teacher on practical matters—as a typical spokesman of our modern ethical atheism—and see what was his inward history, and how his opinions formed themselves. He was, as we have seen already, born in a cathedral town, and the first fifteen years of his life were passed almost under the shadow of the cathedral towers. Nor was this an outward fact only; it corresponded in his case, as we shall see was natural, to an inward one. Those were the palmy days of the Anglican or High Church party. It was then a real power in the English world of thought; much of the intellect of the country was attached to it; and at

Exeter especially, under the celebrated Henry Phillpotts, its influence over many minds could hardly fail to be prevalent. In Clifford's case this influence seems to have been heightened by every circumstance. His father, in his business capacity, dealt largely in devotional books and bibles; and his high character and his superior position thus specially connected him with the ecclesiastical body. He was, indeed, pre-eminently a churchman's bookseller. At the back of his shop, under a glass case, stood a model of the west front of the cathedral, exquisitely carved in rush pith, the work of one of his own family, and regarded with a double reverence, both for the skill displayed by the artist and the character of the edifice represented. Such were the circumstances that surrounded young Clifford during the first fifteen years of his life—years in which the mind is open to all impressions, and which determine, more than any others, the feelings, if not the thoughts, of a man. And of Clifford it would have been said by a High Churchman that these early years did their best for him. His natural character was, it seems, deeply religious, and he grew up a devout and earnest Anglican. Nor did the faith of his boyhood desert him when he went to London, and must have been brought into contact with other ways of thinking; nor did it fail him even during his undergraduate course at Cambridge. Despite all the new knowledge that his scientific studies brought him, he still believed his Bible; he still revered his prayer-book; and a crucifix, as we have been told by one who knew him, hung on his bedroom wall, when he was first a fellow of his college. But about this time, as we gather from Mr. Pollock, an inward change was beginning in him, and the theology to which he had hitherto trusted began to seem vulnerable to his maturing powers of criticism. But his religious faith was as yet in no way weakened, only his belief in a certain Christian position. All truth must, he believed, be in harmony, and science and history he believed to be a part of truth; but he was growing convinced that science and history were not in harmony with the Anglican theory, and all his problem now was to find a religious system with which they should be. The direction his thoughts took will surprise many. They turned, not, as might seem natural, to the rationalising or the Broad Church School, but to the Church of Rome itself. Nor was this, in Clifford's case, any idle dallying. He set himself to study the Catholic theologians; he acquired some real knowledge of St. Thomas Aquinas, and used all his ingenuity and his scientific acquirements in defending the Catholic position. In his views

at this time there was nothing of the spirit of compromise. He maintained to the fullest the authority of religious dogmas, and he held that they should be received implicitly without demand for proof. Such truths, he believed, were beyond scientific proof, and were only apprehended by man through 'a special theological faculty, or insight.' 'And he actually,' says Mr. Pollock, 'defined superstition as "a belief held "on religious or theological grounds, but capable of scientific "proof or disproof."'

'When or how,' says Mr. Pollock, 'Clifford first came to a clear perception that this position of quasi-scientific Catholicism was untenable, I do not exactly know.' We may ourselves remark, however, that it could not have lasted for more than two years after his having gained his fellowship. 'But I know,' Mr. Pollock adds, 'that the discovery cost him an intellectual and moral struggle, of which traces may be found here and there in his essays.' According to the same authority, this profound change of view was accomplished gradually, and 'without any violent reaction, or rushing to the opposite extreme.' On such matters Mr. Pollock has a right to speak with confidence, but we have reason to think that he is here perhaps mistaken. A story is told of Clifford, by one who knew him at this time, which would lead us, on this matter, to an exactly opposite conclusion. Clifford, as we have said already, had been wont to keep a crucifix in his bedroom, we believe for devotional purposes. One morning this revered symbol was found inverted, and placed upon it was a Phrygian cap of liberty. For the truth of this story we cannot ourselves vouch, but the source it came from seemed to us to be trustworthy; in itself it does not look like an invention, and it is also in harmony with many subsequent facts which Mr. Pollock himself tells us, and which Clifford's own words bear witness to. Whether this crisis in his opinions, however, were thus focalised or no, the forces that prepared and completed it were of course at work silently before and after. It would seem that when he gained his fellowship he entered on a new stage of mental excitement and activity; and we can see plain signs of this in a paper on 'Mental Development' which he read that same year before the Royal Institution. The paper in itself is not very remarkable, except as an example of his extreme clearness of style, and as an indication of the studies that were now engaging his mind, and undermining his old convictions. We see how he was assimilating the various teachings of science, and how he was pondering in especial over those of Darwinism. But his activity did not

end here. Side by side with this quickening interest in the physical side of things, an interest sprang up in metaphysical questions also, and he began to study eagerly Spinoza, Hume, and Berkeley, to which he added, as we have seen already, the philosophy of the Catholic Schoolmen.

Such seems to have been the state of his mind during the two years of his residence as a fellow at Trinity, and the twenty-fourth and the twenty-fifth of his life. There is something touching and of great interest in the picture of this young and eager don, with such earnest and ingenuous purpose and such rare powers and perseverance, thus painfully fighting his way towards what he thought the truth, as a larger social and a larger intellectual horizon were at the same time opening out before him. However sudden may have been his final break with Christianity, the beliefs with which he sought to replace the loss took some years in settling themselves; and, in spite of whatever Mr. Pollock may say, Mr. Pollock's own statements show that there was at first something 'extreme' in them, which Clifford afterwards modified. Thus he was inclined at first to think that he found in the doctrine of evolution something that far more than made up for what he lost in theology. He rushed from the sorrow of loss into the joy of discovery. 'For two or three years,' says Mr. Pollock, 'the knot of Cambridge friends, of whom Clifford was 'the leading spirit, were carried away by a wave of Darwinian 'enthusiasm; we seemed to ride triumphant on an ocean of new 'life and boundless possibilities.' Like most other young men in the same stage of development, Clifford turned his thoughts towards the politics of republicanism. He conceived an enthusiastic admiration for Mazzini; he read and quoted the poetry of Mr. Swinburne, and thought 'Songs before Sunrise' some of the wisest and most precious poems ever written. All this was bound up closely with his scientific theories; and Mazzini he regarded as the priest, and Mr. Swinburne as the prophet, of evolution. He seems indeed, at this time, to have worked himself into a feverish and artificial state of excitement about the prospects held out to him by his new view of things. 'Shall there not,' he wrote in a notebook during his later days at Cambridge, 'be a new revelation of a great and more 'perfect cosmos, a universe fresh-born, a new heaven, and a 'new earth? *Mors janua vitæ*; by death to this world we 'enter upon a new life in the next. . . . The new incarnation may need a second passion, but evermore beyond it is 'the Easter glory.' The main definite idea that was embodied in this excitement was 'a conception,' as Mr. Pollock puts

it, 'of freedom as the one aim and ideal of man. . . . It 'included Republicanism as opposed to the compulsory aspect 'of government and traditional authority in general, but was 'otherwise not bound to any particular theory in politics. 'Indeed it forbade binding oneself irrevocably to any theory 'whatever; and the one commandment of freedom was thus 'expressed: "Thou shalt live and not formulise." . . . "There ' "is one thing in the world," Clifford wrote at this time, "more ' "wicked than the desire to command, and that is the will to ' "obey."'

But this stage of thought was only a passing one. When he quitted Cambridge, at the age of twenty-five, and removed to London as a professor at University College, his views upon such subjects began slowly to be changed and modified; and he was probably aware himself that they were not yet determined, since for five years longer he never gave them publicly any direct utterance, or began his ministry of practical teaching and prophecy. During these five years, indeed, he published but six essays, and the subjects of them were remote from common life, although, in reality, closely connected with it. In the February of 1870 he delivered a discourse before the Royal Institution on 'Theories of the Physical Forces,' which was printed in the 'Proceedings' of that body. He delivered a lecture at Manchester two years afterwards on 'Atoms,' and, six months later in the same year, another lecture before the British Association, at Brighton, on the 'Aims and Instruments of Scientific Thought.' In March, 1873, he again lectured before the Royal Institution, his subject this time being 'The Philosophy of the Pure Sciences;' and in 1874 he lectured on the 'Beginning and the Ending of the Earth,' and on the 'Connexion of Mind and Body.' In these discourses, as their several titles denote, what he mainly aimed at explaining (and he did this with a most admirable lucidity) was the chief conclusions that modern science had come to concerning the constitution of matter, the history of the material universe, the connexion of the brain with consciousness; and further, though in a less successful and more faltering way, the nature of scientific knowledge as a whole, regarded from the metaphysical stand-point. But he touched only here and there, far off and indirectly, on such questions as morals and religion, and the practical hopes of the human race. Signs, however, are not wanting that it was to these questions he was gradually leading up, and that it was on these that he was preparing himself to speak before long with authority.

It was during this period, as his biographer tells us, that his philosophy, as distinct from his science, took its final shape, and the lectures themselves show us how continually his mind was dwelling on it. We find him not only dealing with atoms, with heat, with the structure of the nervous system, but with object and subject, the Me and the Not-me, the existence of necessary truths, and the uniformity of nature in the case of conscious action. More than this, too, we find that he has been busy with history, and that he has been endeavouring diligently to discover in it his philosophy teaching by example. Everywhere there is a sound of active mental preparation, and we feel that the forces are being massed for some more practical purpose. He is placing and pointing his artillery, that he may command human life. He defines progress for us, and tells us it is the same thing as science. He gives the general history of 'light and right' during the past two thousand years; how these existed for eight centuries on the shores of the Mediterranean, till, under the blighting influence of the Church, they 'went into abeyance,' and there ceased to be such a thing as 'goodness' in Europe—or would have ceased, had it not been for Arab or for Jew, who saved the sacred treasure from the rage and hatred of Christianity, which was nothing, in Clifford's judgment, but a power of 'disease and delirium.' Human history, he tells us, is the history of the progress of man; 'the progress of man is one 'with scientific thought;' for nearly 'twenty-two centuries,' he adds, the upward life of humanity has depended on one sacred book for its chief 'guide and encouragement,' and this is not, as is commonly supposed, the Bible, but the Propositions of Euclid. The meaning of all this we shall see presently. As yet he had not expressed it plainly. But he comes nearer to practical questions in other places. In 'Body 'and Mind' we see that the questions of 'fate and free-will,' of immortality, and of responsibility, are pressing close upon him; and in 'The First and Last Catastrophe,' in which he deals with the age and the duration of the earth, he does actually utter his first words of preaching. Towards the end of this lecture he says that the greatest of all our interests is bound up with the 'consciousness that exists upon the earth,' and that corresponds, part for part, with the brain of the organised being. For all organised beings on the earth, some day or other, there is in store a final destruction, and for those who can see the force of scientific evidence the conclusion seems inevitable that all human consciousness will be finally destroyed with them; and 'it is a very serious thing,' says

Clifford, 'to consider that not only the earth itself and all that beautiful face of nature we see, but also the living things upon it, and all the consciousness of men and the ideas of society which have grown up upon the surface, must come to an end. We who hold that belief must just face the fact and make the best of it. . . . Do I seem to say, "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die"? Far from it. On the contrary, I say, "Let us take hands and help, for this day we are alive together."' "

The year in which these words were written may be said to have closed Clifford's period of mental preparation. The year following, he made his first appearance as a professed authority on the most momentous and profound questions; and he began his utterances with no uncertain sound. A book had appeared about this time, called 'The Unseen Universe,' the work of two eminent men of science, who sought by certain ingenious theories to reconcile modern materialism with Christian theology, and especially to find a place in it for the belief in our personal immortality. The publication of this work loosened Clifford's tongue, and set free the thoughts and feelings that had been so long gathering. And what seems to have excited him in it was not the method of the authors, but their aims—the special doctrines which they were desirous of defending. Since, five years ago, Clifford had been studying Aquinas, a vast change had indeed come over him. Then, if he must lose religion, the loss would, he felt, be a heavy one. Even fifteen months ago there seemed to him a profound sadness in it. But now his mood was different. What we saw him once regretting, we now find him hating. He can hardly speak of a Christian doctrine except in the language of parody; he seems nervously anxious to be as offensive as possible, and his voice seems to vacillate between a sneer and a forced giggle. Towards the end the note changes somewhat, and the young professor of thirty concludes with this awful warning:—

"Only for another half-century let us keep our heavens and hells and gods." It is a piteous plea; and it has soiled the hearts of these prophets, great ones and blessed, giving light to their generation, and dear in particular to our own mind and heart. These sickly dreams of hysterical women and half-starved men, what have they to do with the strength of the wide-eyed hero, who fears no foe with pen or club? . . . That which you keep in your heart, my brothers, is the slender remnant of a system which has made its red mark on history, and still lives to threaten mankind. The grotesque forms of its intellectual belief have survived the discredit of its moral teaching. Of this what the kings could bear with the nations

have cut down; and what the nations left the right heart of man by man revolts against day by day. You have stretched out your hands to save the dregs of the sifted sediment of a residuum. Take heed lest you have given soil and shelter to that awful plague which has destroyed two civilisations and but barely failed to slay such promise of good as is now struggling to live among men.'

Having thus traced Clifford's opinions up to the time when they took their final consistency, we will now examine in detail what his formed system was. Ultimately and essentially it was a practical, an ethical system; but the ethical part of it rested on three others, which we may call, with sufficient accuracy, the physical, the metaphysical, and the historical; and these, as treated by him, we will now consider separately. Numerous and diverse as are the details of all three, for Clifford their primary outcome was one very simple message—there is no God, no soul, no future life. We say this is what he learned from them primarily; because in a secondary way he looked to science doubtless for many conquests over nature that would ameliorate man's condition, and to history for many lessons that would guide his conduct, in addition to that general system by which religion was to be superseded. But to destroy religion—that soiling power, that grotesque threatener of mankind, that awful plague, that portentous phantom, the offspring of disease and hysteria—to destroy this, and to leave the ground clear for what was better, seems to have been the first personal anxiety of Clifford with regard to his own inner convictions, as well as the first practical step in the general reconstruction of thought. That Clifford's conversion to unbelief was genuine it is not possible to doubt. He yielded with sorrow and reluctance to what he thought overwhelming evidence. But he seems subsequently to have been conscious that the peace bought by the victory was not proportionate to the pain he had endured in gaining it. A vague misgiving seems still to have haunted him, that the religion he had rejected might, after all, be the true one, and that the sufferings he had undergone might be sufferings in the cause of falsehood. That he respected these misgivings, or seriously entertained them, we do not for a moment mean. We mean the exact contrary. He resolved not to entertain them; he resolved to despise them. He regarded them as the voices of an intellectual tempter whom it was his business to exorcise; but still they were there with their disturbing whisper, continually forcing him to exclaim, 'Get thee behind me, Satan!' There is reason to believe that this was the case from the evidence of certain of those who knew Clifford. But, even

were evidence of this kind wanting, the same fact might, we think, be gathered from his writings. In physics, in metaphysics, and in history, underlying all his other interests, there seems to have been a nervous, half-unconscious, and almost instinctive watchfulness over every alleged fact and every theory, to see whether, directly or indirectly, it would give the least assistance to theology; and if it would do this, Clifford was prepared to reject it. It is this, we think, that accounts for the bitterness that is so often traceable in his writings. He is still afraid that he may have scotched the snake, not killed it; and he is perpetually stamping on it, to make sure that it shall not revive.

This is least manifest in his dealing with physical questions, but even here it is distinguishable. Of his physical creed we need not speak at length, because he had himself little to do with elaborating it, and its outlines are also familiar to the world at large. Clifford was not, nor did he profess to be, a specialist in any department of physical knowledge. But he was a diligent and accurate student of all the best authorities, and he could often explain experiments and discoveries more clearly than could the discoverers and experimentalists themselves. But though, in his knowledge of the detailed facts of physics, he was thus far removed from the lay world in general, the most momentous lessons that those facts seemed to teach him were only those that the lay world could appreciate; and these, though, as we have said, familiar now to most of us, it will be well to state briefly. In the first place, then, all nature is uniform. There has never been in it anywhere any breach of continuity; and it follows from this—the following are Clifford's own words—‘that the state at this moment of any ‘detached fragment [of the universe], say a particle of matter ‘at the tip of my tongue, is an infallible record of the eternal ‘past, an infallible prediction of the eternal future. . . . As ‘the history of eternity,’ he adds, ‘is written in every second ‘of time, so is the history of the universe written in every ‘point of space.’ Its history as a whole, our own limited powers have not permitted us to discover. It is, however, self-existent. It has been the work of no conscious intelligence; and, so far as we know, *design* is altogether peculiar to the animals living upon the earth. Consciousness cannot exist without a brain; and the only rational conception of an intelligent Deity would oblige us to suppose the whole universe to be a brain. But in this case, Clifford argues, God could know nothing of human actions, and he could only influence the course of events by his weight. Any such notion

as this, however, we may set aside. 'The universe,' he says, 'is made up of atoms and ether. There is no room in it for 'ghosts.' But though certain facts about the constitution of matter generally are all we can arrive at when dealing with the remoter distances of time and space, with regard to our own system, and especially our own planet, we can speak with more confidence. It is this last that most nearly concerns us; and 'what we know with great probability,' Clifford says, is this. Between one and two hundred millions of years ago, the earth was a liquid in a state of intense heat, but in a constant process of cooling. About the date just indicated 'there 'was,' Clifford says, 'a catastrophe, which induced a new rate 'of cooling;' and we 'come to a time when the earth began to 'assume its present state.' The immense distance of that time from our own it is hard for us to realise; but we may gain some better notion of it if we represent as a single year, the six thousand years for which it is commonly said that man has possessed a history, and then say that the time we are speaking of was about eighty or ninety years ago. If Adam had been born in the April of 1879, the present earth would have been born about the end of the last century. At that date there would have been upon its surface no life, no soul, no consciousness—neither thought, nor emotion, virtue, or humanity. But Clifford agrees with Dr. Tyndall in saying that there would have been 'the promise and the potency' of them all. Whatever it may be that we commonly call matter, all that we call spirit was then potentially contained in it; and about the date just indicated the first beginnings took place of what now is human life—took place by spontaneous generation. We may refuse to believe this, and say that life came from elsewhere. But whenever Clifford contemplated this only possible alternative, 'an invariable monitor,' he said, 'of which I can 'give no rational account, invariably whispers "Fiddle-sticks!"' We think, from his own point of view, he does himself here injustice, for his arguments in favour of spontaneous generation are extremely able, and display no small amount of clear thought and acumen; and we think he might have accounted for his monitor very rationally indeed, regarding life only in its first and most simple beginnings. His beliefs from this point were the beliefs now so widely current. By some process or processes of evolution, amongst which the survival of the fittest was an important, though not the only element, life grew more and more complex, more and more organic, more and more conscious, until at last, from some non-human parents, the first human beings appeared on the earth's

surface. A high scientific authority in Germany maintained that this last and central doctrine was not yet proved, and that we had no right to teach it, as yet, as true. This seems to have exercised Clifford's mind considerably, and his last literary work was an answer to it, which is for many reasons very instructive. Clifford said in that answer that it was quite true that we were not certain of the truth of the doctrine in question, but then, further, we were not certain of anything; and he contends that the evidence as to the descent of man is really as cogent as that for the descent of other animals. He argues this point with great ability. But the details of the argument are not our concern here. What we want to call attention to is the degree of certainty which Clifford claimed for the above doctrine as a whole. And it is important to notice this, because not only in the essay to which we are now alluding, but continually elsewhere throughout his works, we find him insisting on the extreme modesty of science, so different from the arrogance of theology. 'We must recollect,' he says, for instance, quoting Professor Huxley as an exponent of his own opinions, 'that any human belief, however broad its basis, however defensible it may seem, is, after all, only a 'probable belief.' And he is constantly asking us to notice how he always prefers to use the word 'probable' rather than 'certain.' But should anyone in this matter really take him at his word, and believe that practically he was in the very least uncertainty either as to the truth of the above-mentioned doctrine, or more particularly as to the descent of man, his answer, he informs us, would be this: 'Don't be so silly; I 'have no patience with you.' Indeed, as to his meaning, he is yet more explicit; and he tells us, in so many words, that when our physicists modestly say they are not certain that man was descended from not-men, and that these not-men were descended from unconscious and inorganic matter, they mean that they are a great deal more certain of the fact than any of us can be as to the taking of Plevna by the Russians. They mean that they are more 'cock-sure' in their doubts than the generality of us are in our certainties.

Such in rough outline being Clifford's physical creed, and such the doubt or certainty with which he held and taught it, let us next consider his metaphysical creed, not forgetting how greatly it is to his credit that he saw the necessity for any metaphysical creed at all. He has arrived, let us remember, from the lifeless and uninhabited earth, at the human race, and at human consciousness; and now comes a question which, though historically it is the last, yet logically is the first of all.

What is consciousness? or rather, What is knowledge? Unlike the majority of modern men of science, Clifford saw that the methods which are commonly called scientific, though they might rear up a vast superstructure of knowledge, yet left the foundations of it to take care of themselves, and that it was possible, unless these were looked to, to undermine them completely. He saw that all material analysis of the universe, all discoveries as to the connexion of mind with brain, all theories of sight and of sensation, and the getting together and transmission of various kinds of knowledge, might, from one point of view, be plausibly proved worthless, and be robbed of all the meaning they were supposed to have. Let us trace all existing things to atoms, and out of the movements of these atoms trace the formation of the body and brain of man, yet from one point of view we have made no advance whatever. The question still remains, what are these atoms? If from one point of view consciousness is produced by them, from another they are the creations of consciousness. If we can think of mind only in terms of matter, we can think of matter only in terms of mind, and it seems that outside our own consciousness nothing exists at all.

‘If I consider merely my own feelings,’ says Clifford, ‘and ask what evidence they give of anything beyond them, it seems to me that I must answer no evidence at all. . . . If I say that such and such things existed at some previous time, I mean that, if I had been there, I could have perceived them. If I say that there is hydrogen in the sun, I mean that, if I could get any of that gas, I should be able to burn it in oxygen, and produce exactly the same impressions on my senses as those which, in the aggregate, I call water.’

It is true that these words betray a certain vacillation of thought, which is not confined to this special passage. But they show us quite sufficiently that the initial problem in question was fully perceived by Clifford. If we say that an atom is the ultimate unit of things, we mean by an atom something that, were our senses fine enough, would exist for us as an individual feeling. And Clifford saw that it was needful to maintain science as something more than the analysis of the feelings of the individual. The progress of philosophy in this respect, Clifford said, began with Berkeley, ‘who established, in a security that has never yielded to attack, the subjective character of the world of phenomena: that this world I perceive is my perceptions, and nothing more.’ But besides these perceptions, said Berkeley, there is also a spirit, a *me* that perceives them. And ‘to get rid,’ says Clifford, ‘of this imaginary soul or substance was the work of Hume.’

The next important step was made by Mill, who defined more completely the views of Hume, and explained by the law of association how we come to believe in the external world. After Mill came Mr. Herbert Spencer, who combined the analysis of mental action given by the association theory with 'the analysis of nervous action supplied by the histologists,' proving that the evolution of mind 'proceeds *pari passu*' with the evolution of the organism.

'Here, then,' says Clifford, 'is the great advantage of Mr. Herbert Spencer in the study of both orders of facts. He can make any step in analysis of the one help in analysis of the other. And accordingly he has carried both to an extent that leaves all previous investigators far behind. But you will see at once that we must look at the question of idealism from the physiological point of view. And accordingly he considers that there *is* something different from our perceptions, the changes in which correspond in a certain way to the changes in the worlds we perceive. He thinks, however, we can never know what it is; and he says—" . . . The antithesis of subject and object, "never to be transcended whilst consciousness lasts, renders impossible "all knowledge of that ultimate reality in which subject and object are "united." . . . Mr. Spencer attempts to make my feelings give me evidence of something that is not included among them. A careful study of all his arguments to that effect has only convinced me over again that the attempt is hopeless.

Though Mr. Herbert Spencer has failed, Clifford tells us that he can himself succeed. 'Can we,' he says, 'get out of 'our hobble and arrive at real knowledge derived from external 'experience, from *messages*, and not from *imagination*? I 'think we can.' But our knowledge, he warns us, will be of the nature not of certainty, but of inference; and inference depends on a something that is not inferred itself. It depends upon one grand assumption, and that assumption is the uniformity of nature. And why, Clifford asks, do we assume that? 'I cannot,' he answers, 'give you a logical 'reason for believing it, but I can give you a physical explanation of the fact that we all do believe it. We believe,' he says—and it will be well to quote this passage *in extenso*—

'we believe a thing when we are prepared to act as if it were true. Now, if you and I had not habitually acted on the assumption of the uniformity of nature from the time when we could act at all, we should not be here to discuss the question. Nature is selecting for survival those individuals and races who act as if she were uniform; and hence the gradual spread of that belief over the civilised world.

'This uniformity may be merely a uniformity of *phenomena*, a law relating to my feelings. So long as I only am concerned, it seems to me that the idealist theory is perfectly sufficient. It is quite capable

of explaining *me*, but when *you* come into the question it is perfectly at a loss. . . . I do believe that you are conscious in the same way that I am; and once that is conceded, the whole idealist theory falls to pieces. For there are feelings which are not my feelings, which are entirely outside my consciousness; so that there is at least an external world. But let us consider now in what way we infer it; why do I believe that there are feelings which are not mine? Because, as I belong to a gregarious race, the greater part of my life consists in acting upon the position that it is true.'

Clifford wrote this as early as 1873; but the views just stated he seems never to have changed subsequently, though he invented, for the sake of accuracy, a new piece of terminology. 'Things presented in my consciousness, phenomena, 'I propose,' he says subsequently, 'to call *objects*,' whilst '*your* feelings, which are not, and cannot by any possibility 'become, objects in my consciousness,' but which 'are inferred, 'and in the very act of inference *thrown out* of my consciousness, recognised as outside of it, as *not* being a part of me, 'I propose to call *ejects*.' Making use of these terms, Clifford proceeds to point out how the belief in the existence of *ejects* profoundly modifies the object. He takes a table for instance, and shows how complex our conception is of it—how it is a conception of 'a table as an object in the minds of men . . . 'an indefinite number of *ejects*, together with one object, which 'the conception of each *eject* more or less resembles.' This complex conception he calls the 'social object,' and we gain the impression of its *externality* by this 'sub-conscious reference to supposed *ejects*.' But Clifford warns us not to think that our argument has brought us too far. Our impression of the 'outness' of the social object thus accounted for does not enable us to argue that there is anything 'outside of 'my consciousness except the minds of other men.' This all-important step yet demands to be taken. We arrive at this by observing 'the correspondence or parallelism between mind 'and body.' Mind, or consciousness, is an exceedingly complex thing. It is not a unit, as thinkers used to suppose. Mind, consciousness, or a sense of personality, consists of 'a 'stream of feelings so compact together that at each instant 'it consists of (1) new feelings, (2) fainter repetitions of previous ones, and (3) links connecting these repetitions.' Now we know from the highest scientific authorities that 'the complexity of consciousness is paralleled by complexity of action 'in the brain,' and there is reason to believe that 'as consciousness co-exists with complex brain motion, so elementary feeling 'co-exists with elementary brain motion.' From this, Clifford

argues, it follows that elementary feeling does not imply consciousness, but that without consciousness 'a feeling can exist 'by itself.' He continues thus:—

'If that doctrine be true, we shall have along the line of the human pedigree a series of imperceptible steps connecting inorganic matter with ourselves. To the later members of that series we must undoubtedly ascribe consciousness, although it must of course have been simpler than our own. . . . As we go back along the line, the complexity of the organism and of its nerve-action insensibly diminishes; and for the first part of our course we see reason to think that the complexity of consciousness insensibly diminishes also. But if we make a jump, say to the tunicate molluscs, we see no reason to infer the existence of consciousness at all. Yet not only is it impossible to point out a place where any sudden break takes place, but it is contrary to all the natural training of our minds to suppose a breach of continuity so great. . . . There is only one way out of the difficulty, and to that we are driven. . . . As the line of ascent is unbroken, and must end at last in inorganic matter, we have no choice but to admit that every motion of matter is simultaneous with some ejective fact or event, which might be a part of consciousness. . . . From this follow two important corollaries. (1) A feeling can exist by itself, without forming a part of consciousness. It does not depend for its existence on the consciousness of which it may form a part. Hence a feeling (or an eject-element) is a *Ding an sich*, an absolute, whose existence is not relative to anything else. *Sentitur* is all that can be said. (2) These eject-elements, which correspond to motions of matter, are connected together in their sequence and co-existence by counterparts of the physical laws of matter. . . . That element then,' Clifford proceeds, 'of which, as we have seen, even the simplest feeling is a complex, I shall call *mind-stuff*. A moving molecule of inorganic matter does not possess mind or consciousness, but it possesses a small piece of mind-stuff . . . and, when matter takes the complex form of a living human brain, the corresponding mind-stuff takes the form of a human consciousness, having intelligence, and volition. . . . The two chief points of this doctrine may be thus summed up:—Matter is a mental picture, in which mind-stuff is the thing represented. Reason, intelligence, and volition are properties of a complex which is made up of elements themselves not rational, not intelligent, not conscious.'

So far as he was himself concerned, Clifford looked on this theory as his own; but he not only tells us that, after it dawned on him, he learned that several of his friends had arrived at something similar, but he adds, in another place, that it now was no mere guess or conjecture, but the view at which all the greatest thinkers had arrived and were arriving; and he intended to have included it in a book to be called 'The Creed 'of Science.'

We will not at present pause to criticise, but will pass on first to the remaining parts of his system. Thus far he has

derived living and conscious man from inanimate and unconscious matter, and has explained what that matter is, and the process of its transformation. If this account be true, it follows without saying that all knowledge is derived from experience, and cannot possibly have any other source—not the experience of the individual only, but the slowly acquired and transmitted experience of the race. Clifford saw, however, that there was one great difficulty in the way of this theory, and that was the necessity and the universality of the truths of geometry. Having spoken of the various ways in which these have been explained, ‘it seems,’ he says, ‘to me that the Kantian dilemma about universal propositions is just as valid now, in spite of these explanations, as it was in his time. . . . Either I have some source of knowledge other than experience, and I must admit the existence of *a priori* truths, independent of experience; or I cannot know that any universal statement is true.’ Now experience, Clifford says, *must* be the only source of knowledge, for if it were not, the evolution theory would be found inadequate; ‘so that I am driven,’ he continues, ‘to conclude in regard to every apparently universal statement, either that it is not really universal . . . or that I do not know that it is true.’ He was well aware that this alternative presented many apparent difficulties, and that these were not to be removed without much intellectual labour. But the way out of them, he conceived, had been at last discovered by certain modern Continental speculators, whose opinions he embraced with enthusiasm. This school has sought to effect a complete revolution in our conception of geometrical truths. Its position is that these are neither necessarily nor universally true now, and that in the remoter past they may not have been true at all. There may be triangles whose angles do not equal two right angles; there may be converging parallel lines; there may be two straight lines that enclose a space. The change in scientific ideas indicated by these startling doctrines is, says Clifford, ‘of transcendent importance,’ and for this reason: ‘it is a change in our conception of the cosmos. Were the Euclidean assumptions true, the constitution of the universe, at an infinite distance from us, would be as well known as the geometry of this room . . . so that here we should have real knowledge of something at least that concerns the cosmos, something that is true throughout the immensities and the eternities. That something Lobatchewsky and his followers have taken away. . . . The knowledge of immensity and eternity is replaced by a knowledge of Here and Now.’ And thus, Clifford argued,

we have no knowledge that the evolution theory will not account for, and, as a supposed corollary, we have no reason for believing in an immaterial soul, and no parallels by which to illustrate and support a belief in a theological intuition.

Let us now pass on to Clifford's doctrine of the human will. 'The mind,' he says, 'is to be regarded as a stream of feelings which runs parallel to, and is simultaneous with, the action of that particular part of the brain in which the cerebrum and the sensory tract are excited.' The body, of which the brain is a part, and on which its action is dependent, 'is a physical machine, which goes by itself according to a physical law, that is to say, is automatic. An automaton is a thing which goes by itself when it is wound up, and we go by ourselves when we have food.' Were other men not conscious, we might regard them as 'mere machines;' but, as a matter of fact, they are machines attended by consciousness—they are conscious automata. Clifford here anticipates the objections, that if we are automata, we have no freedom of will and no moral responsibility. But with both of these he makes short work indeed. So far from the doctrine of automatism being a denial of the doctrine of free will, it is, he says, the only accurate expression of it. An automaton, he says, is the exact opposite of a puppet. A puppet requires to be pushed or pulled by wires, and an automaton goes by itself. People only object, Clifford thinks, to the doctrine of human automatism because they are thinking of automata that have been made by man with certain definite intentions, and whose whole action is determined by a person outside; but the race of human automata have collectively made themselves. And this, he says, puts the two cases on an entirely different footing. For the will to be free, we need no doctrine of the creation of energy in the brain; we need not believe that in the movements of the brain-molecules the uniformity of nature is even infinitesimally violated. If we want to know what free will is, says Clifford, Kant is the man to tell us; and free will, according to Kant, is that property which enables us to originate events independently of foreign determining causes; 'which, it seems to me,' proceeds Clifford, 'amounts to saying precisely that we are automata, that is, we go by ourselves, and do not want anybody to push or pull us.' With similar facility he goes on to show us that exactly the same conclusion is contained in the doctrine of responsibility. 'If,' he says, 'there is a certain point where the law of causation does not apply, where my action does not follow by regular physical causes from what I am, then I am not responsible for it, because it

'is not I that do it. So you see the notion that we are not 'automata destroys responsibility.' Clifford, however, does not end here, but adds this significant sentence:—

'Moreover, if we once admit that physical causes are not continuous, but that there is some break, then we leave the way open for the doctrine of a destiny or a providence outside of us, overruling human efforts, and guiding human history to a foregone conclusion. . . . I do think that if it is right to call any doctrine immoral, it is right so to call this doctrine, when we remember how often it has paralysed the efforts of those who were honestly climbing up the hillside towards the light and right, and how often it has nerved the sacrilegious arm of the fanatic or the adventurer who was conspiring against society.'

Having carried our survey of Clifford's views thus far, we are now, as the above sentence may suggest to us, in a position to enter upon a new part of them—the historical. We include in history not those times only of which we have written records, but those times also which are sometimes called pre-historic; for in these were first shaped the beginnings of that society against which the fanatics of theism have so often conspired, and we can understand society only by a study of the first beginnings of it. Thus out of historical knowledge springs directly ethical knowledge, or the knowledge of right and wrong. It is the opinion of Clifford's school that up to a very recent date the whole civilised world has been in error on these matters—completely in error theoretically, and in very grave error practically. The cause of this confusion has been the theories of theology, which represented ethics as resting on a completely false foundation; and this confusion it is that Clifford's school have undertaken to dispel. For the source, it tells us, of our moral rules and obligations we must look to no superhuman lawgiver. Morality is nothing if not human. It is nothing but the necessary cause, accompaniment, and condition of the gradual evolution of society. It is, in other words, the condition of co-operation; and co-operation has been imperative on man for two reasons—first, because of the struggle for existence; secondly, because men are gregarious animals. The human struggle for existence was at first not a struggle of individual against individual so much as a struggle of tribe against tribe. The original savage, says Clifford, being little able to reflect, was probably not possessed clearly of the conception of his individual self. He was, however, preyed upon perpetually by unreflecting and immediate desires; and thus his conception of self was not only less used and developed, 'but was also,' says Clifford, 'less definite and more wide.' He found that the satisfaction of his immediate desires de-

pendent on the strength and the well-being of his tribe; and thus this external object, his tribe, became associated with all his pains and pleasures, and was identified by him with himself. 'Now the tribe,' says Clifford, '*quâ* tribe, has to exist, and it can only exist by aid of such an organic artifice as the conception of the tribal self in the minds of its members. Hence the natural selection of those races in which this conception is most powerful.' But, along with this kind of primeval progress, something else also was in process of development; and that was the conception of the individual self, not as identified with the tribal self, but as distinguished from it. Thus gradually there were developed in the individual two rival selves, each of which 'became fixed as a specific character in the constitution of social man.' The quality or disposition in an individual which gives his individual self the supremacy we now know under the common name of selfishness; while the quality or disposition which gives his tribal self the supremacy is called by Clifford *piety*. Man had by this time grown a more or less civilised being; and his actions had lost much of their instinctive character, and had become to a great extent calculating and deliberate. The result of this progress was to increase the power of selfishness as the rival of piety, and to produce what we now know as the conscious moral struggle. Piety, therefore, says Clifford, had to be 'encouraged,' and it was encouraged by 'the common approbation of individual acts,' regarded as good for the community; and natural selection in the long run has preserved those tribes which have approved of the right things—namely, those things which at that time gave the tribe an advantage in the struggle for existence.

'And now,' says Clifford, 'let us take the man who habitually does such things as are advantageous for the tribe. Such a man the tribe cannot fail to approve of; and the pious or tribal self of each member of the tribe says to such a man "I like you." This is moral approbation. But let us take another case. Let us suppose a man has done something that is obviously harmful to the tribe, owing to his selfishness having got the better of his piety. By-and-by his piety reasserts itself, and the man says "In the name of the tribe, I do not like this thing that I, as an individual, have done." . . . This self-judgment in the name of the tribe,' Clifford proceeds, 'is called Conscience. If the man goes farther and draws from this act an inference about his own character, he may say "In the name of the tribe, I do not like my individual self." This is Remorse. . . . In a mind sufficiently developed to distinguish the individual from the tribal self, conscience is thus a necessary result of the existence of piety; it is ready to hand as a means for its increase.'

Thus far, however, Clifford admits that he has only accounted

for conscience in its elemental form. If we wish to understand the present moral nature of man, we must consider how society has used the feelings of the individual as a means for its own preservation. In our present state of development the moral sense has become purely intuitive; conscience gives us imperative orders, assigning no reasons. Now how has this come about? It has come about in this way. Conscience in the individual, at this stage of man's development, represents not the experience and wisdom of the individual, but the inherited wisdom of the tribe, which has been ingrained in the individual, not only through natural selection and the survival of the fittest, but by the two following processes, of which one is direct and the other indirect. If a man offends, the tribe may directly express its disapproval by killing the man, or inflicting on him some material punishment; or else it may punish him indirectly, by pouring out its anger and contempt upon his selfishness, until his own pious self takes part with the tribal judgment, and endorses the condemnation that is thus passed upon him. Finally, to these processes we must add a third, which is a union of the former two. 'Self-judgment,' says Clifford, 'in the name of the tribe, becomes associated with 'very definite and material judgment by the tribe itself;' and thus the motive power of conscience is 'strengthened to an 'enormous degree,' and its decisions are guided and made definite by the definite nature and occasion of the public penalty.

Such, then, is the natural history of the growth of conscience, which Clifford thinks amply sufficient to explain it in its present condition. And from this explanation of it he thinks we arrive at a clear notion of what we mean by moral responsibility. We are morally responsible, he says, 'when 'we can be punished for doing wrong, with approval of the 'tribal self,' be the punishment either our own self-condemnation or the condemnation or the punishment of us by others. And 'responsibility,' says Clifford, 'implies two things—(1) The 'act was a product of the man's character and of the circumstances, and his character may to a certain extent be inferred 'from the act; (2) the man had a conscience which might have 'been so worked upon as to prevent him committing the act.'

And now comes the grand conclusion to which the above views lead us. The old conception of virtue was an entirely wrong one. It was not only not the truth, but the direct denial of the truth. According to the old theory, we were to be virtuous, because we owed a debt to ourselves or to the God who made us, and for whose sake we were bound to keep ourselves pure. But according to the new theory we

owe ourselves nothing. Self-improvement, as self-improvement, is a vice, and not a virtue.

'There are,' says Clifford, 'no self-regarding virtues. The qualities of courage, prudence, &c., can only be *rightly* encouraged in so far as they are shown to conduce to the efficiency of the citizen; that is, in so far as they cease to be self-regarding. The duty of private judgment, of searching after truth, the sacredness of belief which ought not to be misused on unproved statements, follow only on showing of the enormous importance to society of a true knowledge of things. And any diversion of conscience from its sole allegiance to the community is condemned *à priori* in the very nature of right and wrong.'

Such being the case, Clifford looked on what is commonly called history—that is, such history as is derived from written records—as the above philosophy teaching by example. For him such history was the history of the true view of things, obscured by superstition and misconception—sometimes more obscured and sometimes less—and ever struggling to break through what obscured it. So far as in the present volumes he appeals to past events, he appeals to them only to bear him out in his ethical and non-religious theories, and to show that these at last are gaining their final victory, and are ushering in a new era. And what is the result? Clifford was prepared to tell us.

'The dim and shadowy outlines,' he says, 'of the superhuman deity fade slowly away from before us; and as the mist of his presence floats aside we perceive with greater and greater clearness the shape of a yet grander and nobler figure—of Him who made all gods and shall unmake them. From the dim dawn of history, and from the inmost depth of every soul, the face of our father Man looks out upon us with the fire of eternal youth in his eyes, and says, "*Before JEHOVAH was, I AM!*"'

And now let us enquire finally what Clifford's practical preaching was to this new age which he conceived himself, amongst others, to be inaugurating. What was it that he tried to make the men about him do, and that he concluded they would do? In the first place, as we have seen already, he said to them: Don't think about saving your own souls. They are nothing to you. Don't think about any duties to a superhuman deity, for there is no such being, and, even if there were, you could have no duties towards him. These two beliefs have been the source of half the evil that is in the world. In the second place he said to them: Instead of your own souls and your God, you must put society. At present you must put the special community to which you happen to belong, and by-and-by, when you grow more and more instructed, you must learn to include in that com-

munity all the human race. And how are you to serve the community? and what is to be the result of your service? You are to serve it by striving after 'increased efficiency, 'each of you in your special work, as well as in the social 'functions which are common to you all. You must strive 'each of you to be a better citizen, a better workman, a 'better son, husband, or father.' And if you do this, all of you, the community of which you are each of you a part will through all the coming generations grow healthier and better; it will go from strength to strength, and will by-and-by reach heights of which we have hardly a conception.

The progress of the community, then, being the end of all individual action, how are we of this generation to adapt our means to the end? 'Such adaptation,' says Clifford, 'may be 'produced in two ways that we at present know of—by processes of natural selection, and by the agency of an intelligence in which an image or idea of the end preceded the use 'of the means.' Now, natural selection is the work of nature. The individual teacher has nothing to do with that. His sole concern lies with the intelligence of those he addresses. And not only is it this only that he can work upon, but it is this that for the future must be the chief force at work. Progress hitherto has been largely unconscious. Men thought indeed they were going in one direction, but natural causes have been really taking them in another. But now a change has come. The world is being baptised into a new life. The real meaning of the moral sense is at last discovered, 'and it must,' says Clifford, 'be directed for the future by our conscious discovery 'of the tribal purpose which it serves.' 'Conscience,' he repeats again, 'is the voice of man within us commanding us to 'work for man.' And thus the work of the preacher and the teacher is twofold; he has in the first place to direct this conscience, and in the next place he has to strengthen it, and to give force to its mandates.

Clifford's premature death has, of course, left his practical teaching incomplete. He has indeed accomplished with sufficient clearness the first of the two tasks just mentioned, but he hardly had time to do more than touch explicitly on the second. He has told us that the great work of each of us is to make our piety overcome our selfishness, and that the object of our piety is the social organism. But how this piety for the future is to be strengthened in its hard struggle with its enemy he has only given us hints here and there by the way. His views, however, on this matter we can arrive at pretty clearly, and of all his views they are perhaps the most significant. We will

speaking of them presently; but first of all let us look back on the other parts of his system, the main outlines of which we have now glanced at.

It is true that in these there is nothing that, at the present time, can be very new or startling to any of us. But, as assimilated and expressed by Clifford, we have thought the modern system well worth considering. Amongst our scientific thinkers he was a man of unusual culture, as well as of unusual ability; and the weakness of the theories he advocated, and the insufficiency of the training he had received, are best visible in a man who naturally was so highly gifted.

Of his views on physical science there is obviously no need to speak. He was simply here an intelligent disciple of others, whom we have no call to criticise. But what we do propose to examine is the methods by which he proposed to place this physical science on a firm philosophic basis, and to reconcile its teachings with the verdicts of our moral consciousness. And first let us consider how he deals with the first of all questions—the existence of an external world. Its existence, as we have seen, he conceived he had established, and that he had set right on this point all former philosophers, from Berkeley to Herbert Spencer. And it must be admitted that in his views and in the exposition of them there are displayed great ingenuity and great power of thought. But when we come to examine the final upshot of them, we shall find that they all end in nothing. He succeeds with extreme skill in travelling round a circle, and in the end he finds himself just where he started. And, curiously enough, in one place he admits this himself. We can only, he maintains, free ourselves from the position of absolute idealism by our belief in what he calls ‘personal ejects;’ and why, he asks, does he believe in these? why does he believe that there are feelings which are not his own? ‘Because,’ he answers, ‘as I belong to a gregarious race, the greater part of my life consists in acting upon the supposition that it is true.’ This is literally the only answer that he gives to the great question; and he gives this not hastily, but with all deliberation, and he leads solemnly up to it, as a piece of profound wisdom. Now what does this sentence amount to? To believe that there are feelings which are not his own is the same thing as to believe that he belongs to a race. The question, then, that he is really asking is, ‘Why do I believe that I belong to a race?’ And his only answer is, ‘Because I belong to a gregarious race.’ But this is not all. In another place precisely the same question is again asked by him, and what he says there is very different and

far more to the purpose. 'How,' he says, 'this inference is justified, how consciousness can testify to anything outside itself, I do not pretend to say. I need not untie a knot that the world has cut for me long ago. . . . The position of absolute idealism may therefore be left out of count, although each individual may be unable to justify his dissent from it.' Now let us suppose this last statement true, and we have one thing to observe that Clifford seems altogether to have forgotten. It may be quite true that the belief in question is not only inexplicable, but indubitable; but we by no means have disposed of it by admitting that. According to Clifford's philosophy all knowledge is based on experience; if he cannot maintain that position, his whole system falls to the ground: and here we find him, apparently quite unconscious of the results of it, not admitting only but proclaiming that the one fact of our daily life, on our knowledge of which all other knowledge is based, is a fact that no experience could have taught us, and that we must have learned it from some other source.

It is true that, granting the existence of the personal eject, Clifford deduces with much ingenuity from it the existence of ejects that are not personal—in other words, the inorganic universe. But here again, in spite of all his skill, his reasonings prove useless. They depend, as we have seen already, upon his theory of the nature of things in themselves. And what does this theory amount to? Ingenious as are the means by which he arrives at his results, the results when arrived at are crude and puerile to an almost inconceivable degree. 'The thing in itself' is, he tells us, elementary feeling, mind-stuff, or quasi-mind; and this is known to us as matter. With every moving molecule of matter there moves also a small particle of mind-stuff which is attached to it. Now, not only must it be obvious to anyone at all trained in philosophical thinking that this theory leaves time, and still more plainly space, entirely unaccounted for; but there is a further and yet more obvious objection to it, which has not escaped even his own enthusiastic biographer. This theory, which Clifford flattered himself was a new form of monism, is in reality nothing but the dualism it was intended to replace; only he chooses to call matter 'mind-stuff,' and he chooses to call mind 'consciousness.' His theory, he tells us, rests on the doctrine that there can be feeling without consciousness, a statement to which it is impossible to affix any meaning whatsoever. The old-fashioned dualism was the statement of a mystery, but it was the statement of it in intelligible language. Clifford transferred the mystery from the statement to the way of stating it; and

instead of simplifying a fact, he merely made his language meaningless.

But the confusion in his philosophy becomes most apparent, and is of most practical importance, when he comes to treat of mind and body in connexion with human automatism and the freedom of the will. It would be hard to imagine, were the fact not before our eyes, that any man of Clifford's powers should have shown himself, on a point like this, so utterly incapable of clear and coherent thought, or of seeing steadily for a moment what is the real point at issue. As a specimen of his philosophical manner, we may first notice how he prepares the ground for himself. 'The will,' he says, 'is not a material thing. It is not a mode of material motion. Such an assertion belongs to the crude materialism of the savage. The only thing that influences matter is the position of surrounding matter, or the motion of surrounding matter;' and thus he lays down, as if to close the question for ever, 'if anybody says that the will influences matter, the statement is not untrue, but it is nonsense. . . . It is a combination of words whose corresponding ideas will not go together.' Anything more utterly false, and we may add foolish, than this, it is not easy to imagine. That will should influence matter may or may not be a possibility; but it is the expression of a distinct belief, and of a belief that is held by a very large number of people. One important example of it is the belief that God orders the world; and Clifford not only holds that to this proposition a very distinct idea can attach itself, but an idea that is so powerful as to be of the utmost practical danger. There is another answer to him that is even more near to hand. He says that to say matter influences will is not untrue, but nonsense. But let us take the converse of this proposition; and that, as he would be the first to admit, is not only not nonsense, but it is true. Give a man wine, and you nerve his will to fight. Give a man more wine, and you put his will to sleep for a time. Stab him in the heart with a dagger, and you extinguish his will for ever.

It is perfectly true, however, to say, that for will to influence matter is, on Clifford's theory, impossible. On that theory, consciousness is nothing but a passive spectator, and the will itself is nothing but a fiction. The strange thing is, that Clifford himself neither admitted nor saw this, but thought he could show, on the contrary, not only that will was a reality, but also that it was free. And this brings us to the climax of his philosophical confusions. 'That man is a free agent appears to me obvious, and that in the natural sense of the words. We

' need ask for no better definition than Kant's: "Will is a kind of causality belonging to living agents, in so far as they are rational; and freedom is such a property of causality as enables them to be efficient agents independently of outside causes determining them; as, on the other hand, necessity is that property of all irrational beings which consists in their being determined to activity by the influence of outside causes." Now this, no doubt, at first sight sounds well enough; but it seems to have escaped Clifford that these words of Kant belonged to one philosophy, and that in being transplanted to another they become nonsense. We need not pause to point out that, in the first place, will, in Clifford's system, is emphatically not a kind of causality at all. All we need remark upon is the use of the words 'outside causes.' Now, according to Clifford, an outside cause is any cause outside 'my consciousness;' and if there is one thing that his theory teaches more plainly than another, it is that men cannot be 'efficient agents independently of outside causes;' nay, more than this, they cannot be agents at all. 'I believe,' says Clifford, 'that I am a free agent, when my actions are independent of the circumstances outside me.' But this, according to his theory, no man's actions ever are. So far from our being independent of such circumstances, we are entirely at the mercy of them; we are like 'all irrational beings,' as described by Kant; 'we are determined to activity by the influence of outside causes.' In fact, the distinction between outside cause and any other kind of cause is here a wholly false one. Clifford says we are free because 'we go of ourselves, we do not want anybody to push or pull us.' Now of course, in a certain sense, we 'go of ourselves,' just as a tree does; but the direction in which we go, if it cannot be said to be determined by anyone pulling us, is determined by countless other things attracting us; and so far as freedom goes, and so far as *outsideness* in the matter goes, there is nothing to choose really between propulsion and attraction. I place three children on a stage, telling them not to move of themselves, but to allow me to push and pull them as I please, and I then make them perform certain evolutions. The children, in so far as these movements are concerned, are merely marionnettes or puppets. Clifford himself would have maintained that they were not free agents. Supposing, however, I knew the nature of the children sufficiently well, I could, by a certain arrangement of sweetmeats or other attractive objects about the stage, produce exactly the same movements, and I should be able to predict them with exactly the same certainty. The children in both cases would have

been equally at my mercy; nor would it make the least difference in the present argument whether the cause that determined them to activity were my hand or a sugar-plum. That there is an accidental difference between the two cases is true enough, but the difference is only an accidental one. The action is in one case accompanied by the feeling which we call volition, and in the other case it is not. According to Clifford and his school, there are really but two kinds of action, each of them equally inevitable and equally necessary—action in which we are propelled, and action in which we are attracted; and what Clifford means by will, or by free will,* is nothing but the consciousness of being attracted, not propelled.

From this subject we pass to one directly connected with it, to the conscience and moral responsibility; and we shall find that precisely the same confusion exists in Clifford's mind here. 'In order,' he says, 'that a man may be morally responsible for an action, three things are necessary:—(1) He might have done something else; that is to say, the action was not wholly determined by external circumstances, and he is responsible only for the choice which was left him. (2) He had a conscience. (3) The action was one in regard to the doing or not doing of which conscience might have been a sufficient motive.' Now, from our point of view, all this is completely true; but that point of view is not Clifford's. All through this there runs a conception that in Clifford's system is totally inadmissible. He is perpetually presupposing the presence of some mysterious force whose existence he has already denied—some force that need not follow the uniformity of nature—some *fatis avolsa potestas*. He betrays this in his use of the words 'might have been.' But in his system such a mood of the verb has no place at all. Nothing might have been but the things that have been; and were it not for the limitation of our own knowledge of details, we should see that it was as absurd to say a man might have acted otherwise than he did act, as to say that a stream might flow up a hill.

Still, however this may be, it will be said, and said truly, that conscience is a fact, and the sense of responsibility is a fact; that no theories can take them away; and that, by the bestowal of praise and blame, the conscience may be trained, just as a warped piece of timber may be straightened, so as

* According to Clifford's theory, to call the will free is only a piece of tautology. In the only sense in which the will is ever free, it is always free.

to be of better service in the future, no matter what our views are as to what might have been in the past. But even here the old difficulty clings to us; for, useful as moral blame might be, we shall see that the above view of things must, if it were ever fully adopted by us, completely paralyse our powers of blaming. Clifford says very truly that our right, or, in other words, our ability, to award blame, is in proportion to the presence or the absence of extenuating circumstances. When a man, for instance, has so strong an inclination to drink that we cannot conceive any conscience strong enough to overmaster it, he is not any more responsible for drinking than he would be for coughing if his glottis were irritated. 'But if it is conceivable,' says Clifford, 'that a very strong conscience fully brought to bear might succeed in conquering the inclination, we take a lenient view of the fall, but we shall still regard it as a fall, and say that the man is responsible.' Now between the two classes of actions which Clifford means to indicate there is indeed a difference; but he has quite misconceived its nature. The difference has no reference to the past or to what might have been, but to the future and what we conceive will be. According to Clifford's theory, we are not justified in blaming a man because he has acted in one way when he might have acted in another, but because, if we blame him for what he has done, he will be less likely to offend in the same way again. If we adopt this view, however, there is one point to remember. The blame in this case would be as desirable and as beneficial as in the other, but we shall find ourselves unable to award it. As Clifford himself tells us, blame diminishes as extenuating circumstances multiply; and, on Clifford's theory of human action, every offence has not only extenuating circumstances, but circumstances that are completely exculpating. It is impossible for the worst of men to commit an action which the best of men under like circumstances would not have committed likewise.

We might dwell, did space permit us, on certain further results of the theory we are now considering. We might show how the logical result of it must be, that, if we are any of us responsible for anything, we are responsible not for our own sins, but for the sins of others, and that of those others the two most important parts are our fathers who are dead and our children who are unborn. But this particular matter would involve a long discussion as to the meaning of words and the associations they carry with them. It is more to our present purpose to note what we were before speaking of—the way in

which Clifford has confused the perception that a thing would be desirable with the assumption that it would be possible; for it is this confusion that is most typical of his school, and which runs through all their more immediate preaching as to general human action, and through all their prophecies as to the future that is before humanity.

This leads us to approach the matter from a slightly different point of view. The end and object of our existence is, we have seen, to promote the progress of the community, and this progress is to be effected through the education and the intensification of the conscience. Clifford, it will be seen, here agrees with Mr. Herbert Spencer. Conscience, as conceived of by him, is an inherited tribal instinct traversing the individual appetites. Its voice is an instinctive voice, and its biddings, as Clifford expressly says, do not rest, in the individual, upon their true reasons. But what he and his school propose to do is to alter this state of things; they propose to make conscience rest its biddings on their true reasons, and guide them 'by a conscious discovery of the tribal purpose it serves.' But they forget that in doing this they are putting conscience in an entirely new position. Its instinctive character disappears; nay, more, as conscience it ceases to exist. It dissolves itself into the ordinary intellectual judgment as to the means towards an end, the end in this case being presupposed the most desirable. And thus the problem for the prophets of progress is not how to strengthen conscience, but it is simpler and more direct. It is how to strengthen our conscious devotion to the community, so as to make it more and more dominant over our conscious devotion to ourselves.

And it is the difficulty and even the nature of this problem that Clifford and his school seem entirely to overlook. They imagine that their system will leave them the old power of conscience intact, and that the changes of view that they introduce will only add to it. But they forget one thing. They are right, on their own grounds, in calling conscience instinctive, inasmuch as its biddings do not rest on their true reasons; but they do rest on reasons, even though the reasons be not true. It is only through an assignment of reasons, through a statement of facts, and the drawing a conclusion from them, that conscience has the smallest power of enforcing its orders. This reasoning may be sometimes more articulate, and sometimes less, but it is always there; and one of the propositions contained in it is a personal menace to the individual. It not only gives an order, but it gives a curse or a blessing, and of one or other of these it fore-

tells the sure fulfilment. It is, as Cardinal Newman has said, not only a king, but a prophet and a priest likewise. The truth of this statement, be it remembered, is quite independent of any theological doctrine. As a doctrine it may be true or false, but it certainly is true as an analysis of what conscience has been felt to be by the common consciousness of the mass of conscientious men. Now, according to Clifford's theory, conscience must be powerless as a king, and an impostor as a priest and a prophet. All its influence is, in fact, founded on a false prestige; and what Clifford and his school have fondly and foolishly imagined is that they can destroy the prestige and yet retain the power. They imagine they can remove the fulcrum, and yet employ the lever.

The same singular oversight, the same inability to grasp one entire side of the question, is to be found even more plainly when Clifford deals with Christianity as a fact in the history of progress. The Jews, he informs us, were an eminently conscientious race, because of the difficulties with which, as a tribe, they had to contend in the struggle for existence; and that struggle was successful because their conscience was rightly informed.

'The moral teaching of Christ,' says Clifford, ' . . . is the expression of the conscience of a people who had fought long and heroically for their national existence. In that long and terrible conflict they had learnt the supreme and overwhelming importance of conduct, . . . the weakness and uselessness of solitary and selfish efforts, the necessity for a man who would be a man to lose his poor single personality in the being of a greater and nobler combatant—the nation. And they said all this, after their fashion of short and potent sayings, perhaps better than any other men have said it before or since. It was this heroic people that produced the morality of the Sermon on the Mount.'

This morality it is that is the one thing of value in Christianity; and this Clifford is confident that the world will go on practising with ever-increasing diligence. But of how the world has been induced to practise it in the past he says nothing, he thinks nothing. The importance of the part played by the ideal of Christ—of a Christ either divine or deified, an object at once of love, of worship, and of imitation—seems to have altogether escaped him. Study of history, observation of life, and ordinary common sense, seem alike to have left one half of his mind a complete blank; and whilst speculating on what would be good, if men were to do it, he has forgotten to consider for a moment what it is likely that men will do.

As a parallel to his above account of the origin of Christianity, we may mention his account of the Reformation in England, which is equally ludicrous in the ignorance and the naïve arrogance it betrays. The cause of the event in question was, he says, simple and single. It was none other than our great characteristic as Englishmen; it was 'the principle which forbids the priest to come between a man and his conscience.' Any statement more utterly false than this it is hardly possible to imagine. The English Reformation, as every schoolboy knows, was at first a political event, not a religious one; and the hatred of priests as priests, so far from being a cause of it, was only a late and a long-delayed result. Mr. Pollock himself is obliged to admit that Clifford studied history poetically, not scientifically. We should ourselves prefer to say that he studied it in the spirit of prejudice rather than in the spirit of poetry; and, when we say that the examples we have just adduced are fair, if not favourable, specimens of his historical criticism, the verdict will hardly be thought unjust. On whatever period he touches, his treatment of it is the same. Nor, when we consider his case, is this much to be wondered at. Of historical knowledge he had evidently only smatterings, and even these were fragmentary and disconnected; and he went to these smatterings, as he himself almost acknowledges, with the determination to make them bear witness to foregone conclusions, of which the most important was that all goodness was of purely human origin, and that the chief enemies of goodness were priesthoods generally, and the Christian priesthood in particular. We are far from attributing such a procedure to any dishonesty in Clifford's mind, but wonder certainly arises that to an honest man such a procedure should have been possible. The answer to this is to be found, we think, in that fault of Clifford and his school we were just now indicating; their utter want of any practical knowledge of human nature. Men and women, with all their complex motives, were not, to Clifford, realities. Simple, upright, and prejudiced in a certain way himself, he imagined that the great mass of human kind would be simple, upright, and prejudiced, just as he was. And the little esoteric ambitions and contempts of the common-room or the lecture hall, he mistook for the emotions and aspirations of the human kind in general.

And this is what we meant when we said that Clifford's teaching was to be best understood through his biography. Not only, as we have seen already, will his theory of things not hold together for a moment, but it is utterly unfit for any

practical application. Considering Clifford's genius, such a result is singular; but we conceive it to be explained thus. Clifford's views of life and his desires to influence men were not what they were because he was an accurate thinker or a student of science or of philosophy; they were what they were because he came of the Christian middle class of England, and because every thought and every feeling he possessed was steeped in the beliefs and the sentiments of that class; and when he tells us about the nobleness of humanity and the grandeur of our Father Man, the emotions expressed are not the result of his scientific observations or of his later experiences, but they are the echo or the survival of emotions that had been ingrained in him at his mother's knee or under the arches of Exeter Cathedral. Clifford, as a practical preacher, as a dealer with his brother men, differed little in his knowledge and his feelings from an ordinary Bible-reader. What he did differ in from the Bible-reader was that the latter retains the original theoretical framework of his feelings; whereas Clifford had removed this, and was obliged to supply another. That he failed to see how unsound that other was theoretically, and how inefficient practically, can be explained also by an appeal to his life. His feelings seem, in reality, to have been the thing that guided him; he was determined that his non-theistic theories should support these, and therefore any non-theistic theory that seemed to support them he was ready to accept as sound. Whilst as to the practical side of the question, just as his bringing up had made him deeply religious, and had left his morality, when his religion went, strongly touched with emotion, so had it left him unversed in the ways of the world at large; and whilst endowing him with what, as a private character, we must call a beautiful innocence, it had left him in what, as a public teacher, we must call a fatal ignorance.

If what we have said applied to Clifford only, it would hardly perhaps have been worth saying; but, as we have observed already, it applies not to Clifford only, but to the whole modern school. If, as many think, that school is a really formidable foe to religion, it will be at any rate some comfort to know that it will certainly not destroy religion by replacing it. Its prestige, further, will be rendered less formidable if we reflect on how one of its best instructed and most gifted spokesmen has exhibited himself in these two volumes as hopelessly untrained in philosophy, hopelessly ill-read in history, and without the smallest grasp of that refractory human character of which he boasts that in the future his school will have the sole guidance.

ART. VIII.—*A History of the Reign of Queen Anne.* By JOHN HILL BURTON, D.C.L., Historiographer-Royal for Scotland. 3 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh and London: 1880.

THE death of Queen Anne is one of the events in English history that have graved their mark most deeply on the popular memory; and, whether in jest or reproach, it is still spoken of every day by hundreds who certainly could not tell offhand who Queen Anne was, where she reigned, when she lived, or when she died. But the termination of this Queen's reign carries us back to that momentous time when, notwithstanding the often confirmed Act of Settlement, the succession to the English crown was tottering in the balance—when, until the new king was actually proclaimed, no one could say, with certainty, whether his name would be George or James; whether it would be the herald of liberty and religion, or of tyranny, superstition, and civil war. One is apt to forget that Queen Anne was barely fifty years of age when she died. If the Stuarts had had the vitality of the Guelphs, she might have lived and reigned for another quarter of a century, and the history of England would have been materially changed.

To the student of history, however, the reign of Anne has, throughout, an interest at least equal to that of its closing scene. That, indeed, was a formidable crisis; but for years before, wars, victories, and defeats, foreign negotiations and domestic intrigues, party contests and religious intolerance, the working out of great constitutional problems, the Scotch Union and the establishment of the kingdom of Great Britain, and a magnificent literary period, form the groundwork of a story at once important, instructive, and picturesque—a subject tempting to the novice as well as to the veteran; in the treatment of which, however, experience has shown that the risks of failure far outweigh the chances of success. It is thus that we have so many histories of the reign of Queen Anne: Chamberlain, Boyer, Oldmixon, and Somerville, in the last century—all careful painstaking men, without a glimmer of genius—have attempted to write the annals of this romantic reign; then we have *Lives of Marlborough*, *Lives of Bolingbroke*, and a crowd of other less pretentious and less weighty volumes. But of all these, few can be read with any pleasure, and those few with but little profit.

Had indeed life and health been spared to Lord Macaulay, we should have had such a history of this period as would

have made it practically impossible for any future writer to attempt it. Macaulay's intimate acquaintance with it, in its several phases, was equalled only by his power of artistic arrangement, and his skill in the manipulation of words and sentences. That he would have given us a great work, we cannot doubt. But with all his splendid qualifications for the task, Lord Macaulay had also certain prejudices which would have seriously detracted from the value of his work; and amongst these we should more especially reckon his intense hatred of the Duke of Marlborough. It is too well known that he has almost exhausted the virulence of the English language in his account of various passages in Marlborough's early career, and poured forth his wrath in pages that are not the less unjust because they are surpassingly brilliant. If we may judge from these of what would have been written of the time when Marlborough stood out in solitary grandeur, the foremost figure not in England alone, but in Europe, we may console ourselves that the book was prematurely closed; that our great national hero—great with all his faults—has not been pilloried to all time, with less compunction than if he had been a dead pole-cat to nail on a barn door.

It was not till after the death of Lord Macaulay that Lord Stanhope determined to continue his 'History of England from the Peace of Utrecht,' backwards to the accession of Anne; and his history of her reign was published in 1870. A Stanhope might naturally enter at great length into the history of the war, and especially of the war in Spain; but military history and vivid description were not points in which Lord Stanhope was fitted to excel, and his *Reign of Queen Anne* has rested principally on the former reputation of the author. There was still therefore a blank in our historical literature, which the Historiographer-Royal for Scotland has now endeavoured to fill. Dr. Burton's known ability as an expounder of history and an unraveller of knotty problems had led us to an eager expectation of the work, on which, it was publicly announced, he had been engaged for many years. And this expectation was not unmixed with curiosity; for whilst, on the one hand, it seemed peculiarly fitting that the history of the Union should be told from an imperial point of view by one who had already so well described it from the provincial, on the other we could not but notice that, after a long literary career, during which he had confined himself closely, if not exclusively, to the domestic history of Scotland, he was now venturing on new ground. With every disposition to give his work a favourable reception,

it must be confessed that it is deficient in proportion and in completeness.

The book is divided into twenty chapters of about equal length; of these, one is headed 'The Religious World,' and two 'The Sacheverell Commotions;' one is on International Difficulties—that is, between England and Scotland; one on the Union; and two are devoted to Marlborough's campaigns. These extended over nine of the most brilliant years in our annals, broke the threatening despotism of France, and, for thirty years to come, rendered her powerless for evil. The Union was an event in our national life little less important than the Norman Conquest. Sacheverell's trial, on the other hand, lasted but a few weeks; and was in truth a tempest in a tea-cup. To treat the three subjects at the same length would seem a serious failure in historical or even artistic skill, and we must accept the work, not as a complete history of the period, but rather as the endeavour of an acute and trained intellect to throw light on certain very important, but less popular, phases of it.

As such, Dr. Burton's work is entitled to our consideration. He has, for the first time, brought to light the Godolphin papers, acquired by the British Museum about ten years ago, a collection which, he tell us, is specially rich in materials suited to his purpose; not so much in what are properly termed State Papers, of which 'we may conclude that all of 'any importance or significance during our period are already published; but in the private correspondence of statesmen and other eminences, private correspondence on affairs of 'State.' Aided by these, and by a wide acquaintance with published material, the book, within its peculiar limits, could scarcely fail of being both interesting and instructive; but we regret that so much sound learning and diligent research should be somewhat clouded by a style which is uncouth, often to the verge of affectation. It is not easy to pardon such sentences as, 'The achievements on the banks of the Maas were significant vindications of sanguine prognostications;' or, 'They (the shoeblacks) brought on themselves the name of "the blackguards," thus contributing its most powerful 'appellative to the vituperative nomenclature of the English 'language.' In some places the book bears strange marks of carelessness. The word 'incompatibility' is spelt 'incompatability;' the Empress Maria Theresa is called 'Theresa Maria,' and similar oversights are not infrequent in these pages.

To the careful reader, a more serious fault is the utter want of chronological arrangement. The story ranges wildly

through the whole period, or outside it, without any guiding clue; there are no sign-posts, no dates in the margin, very few in the text, and on those few no reliance can be placed. We are told, for instance, that war was proclaimed on August 4, 1702; it was, in fact, proclaimed on May 4. We are told that Prince George died on October 28, 1710; he died, really, in 1708. Others somewhat similar, such as the name of Catinat for Tallard (i. 302), Toulon for Nice (ii. 74), Tromp for De Ruyter (iii. 129), might almost lead us to fancy that, whilst studying the literature of the age of Anne, the author, like the philosophers of Laputa, has accustomed himself to the attendance of a flapper, in whose occasional absence his hand ceases to control the vagaries of his pen. But we have said enough on such points; it is more congenial with our humour, as well as with our high sense of Dr. Burton's merit, to discuss the matter rather than the manner of what he has written.

Upon her accession to the throne on March 8, 1702, Anne's immediate inheritance was war with France, which was declared a few weeks later, at once by the Queen, the Emperor, and the States-General, the 'Grand Alliance' having been concluded by her predecessor. Then, as ever since, it was fiercely disputed whether 'the balance of power' in continental Europe is any concern of insular England. A large and strong party was averse from any interference in the affairs of Spain or France; and the British taxpayer, caring little for the point at issue in the succession to the Spanish throne, did care a very great deal for the certain increase of taxation which would follow on a renewal of hostilities. The merchants of London or Bristol were, however, able to take a lively interest in the political question, when it was once brought home to them that the extension of Bourbon rule included also the command over their foreign trade; that the Spanish market was already lost to them; that Portugal was bound by treaty to share in the commercial policy of Spain; that the Spanish Netherlands, Italy, the Indies, and Spanish America were all closed; and that Holland and Germany would be equally so, if overpowered by France. But while the statesman and the capitalist were moved by such considerations, to the country party and the people at large the cause of quarrel was the recognition, by Louis XIV., of the son of James II. as King of England. It is difficult to understand this recognition, unless we accept the proverbial maxim that whom the gods would undo they first madden. It has indeed been ascribed to the influence of Madame de Maintenon, who fostered the Stuart cause as that of the true

religion. But more probably Louis was led to believe that, by disbanding her army, England had rendered herself powerless; that she had been unable to oppose his entering on the Spanish succession; that she would be equally unable to avenge the indignity offered to the Act of Settlement; and that he might thus, with impunity, stand before Europe as the champion of the rights of kings and of the Catholic faith. He had not taken into account the strength of the popular feeling. The violation of the Treaties of Partition had scarcely moved the pulse of the people of England; the news that the French king had acknowledged the pretended Prince of Wales—born of a warming-pan—as King of England, roused the fiercest anger through the length and breadth of the country, for the moment united all opinions, stilled the jealousies of party, and made war inevitable.

Yet France was by no means prepared for such a struggle. The previous war had exhausted her resources, which a four years' armed truce had by no means re-established. In 1697 the drain on her population and finances had reduced her to a condition in which peace was absolutely necessary. Internal traffic was stopped; the roads had fallen into decay; the bridges were in ruins. Foreign trade was at an end; and with the closing of the market, manufacturing industry had ceased. It was roughly estimated that the population was reduced by one-fourth, and that of the survivors one-tenth were in a state of beggary; in support of which it is stated, as a particular case, that of 700,000, forming the population of the financial district of Rouen, there were not 50,000 who could buy bread, or who had beds to sleep on. Louis, however, refused to believe in the terrible destitution, or that the reports were not exaggerated. He was willing, indeed, that France should repose, but repose in arms. The war might at any time recommence. He was bent on pushing his claims on the Spanish succession; by negotiation, if possible; if not, by the last argument of kings. The Emperor, on his side, with powerful and opulent allies, was averse from the peace which would share it with his wily adversary. His objections, however, had been overcome, and Europe had entered on that breathing time, so soon to be interrupted by the deaths of the King of Spain and of the deposed King of England; by the French king's recognition of the Pretender; by his acceptance of the Spanish will in favour of his grandson. When, on the eve of the declaration of war, Louis' most bitter and determined enemy was suddenly taken away, the accident seemed to bode well for France: it was, really, the most untoward stroke of

fate. Good soldier as William was, his death opened the way to the career of one vastly his superior in the art of war. Of this, however, Louis was happily ignorant; it appeared to him that not only had the allies lost their most dangerous general, but also that the tie between England and Holland was necessarily loosened. He made, therefore, an effort to secure the Dutch, which Dr. Burton thus describes:—

‘He addressed their High-Mightinesses the States-General in a tone of friendly patronage, shading off into occasional menace. They had shown an ungrateful unconsciousness of the favours he had conferred on them. But the past would be forgiven if there were amendment in the future. They had heretofore been under restraint: they were now free to choose their course, and recover the place they had forfeited in his countenance and friendship. Let them make their choice—quiet and liberty under his august protection, or war and ruin. This was one among the many insolences that seemed to do as much for the subsequent humiliation of the proud king as his reverses in the field. The Estates answered him in proud defiance. They pushed home the dubious references to a state of coercion, accepting them as referring to the loss of their illustrious chief who was King of Great Britain. His memory was fresh, not as an oppressor who had thwarted the national aspirations, but as a friend who had fostered and given power and shape to them; and it was utterly to mistake the nature of their constitution to doubt that they had ever been less free than they had been when visited by their great calamity. They were invited to send a representative to the Court of France. They thought this a needless ceremony; all questions must now abide the issues of war.’

Thus the war began, actually with the siege of Kaiserswerth by the allies, and, on June 10, with the French dash at Nymeguen, a strong and commanding fortress, which Dutch economy had left unarmed and without a garrison. But the Earl of Athlone—Ginkel—in command of a division of the allied army, was able to interpose his force; and though very inferior in numbers, he retreated on Nymeguen, which he occupied. The French spoke of this as chasing the allied army under the guns of the fortress: the allies could more correctly describe it as the baffling of the French attempt on Nymeguen. A few weeks later Marlborough entered on the command, and began a career of conquest and victory which has but few parallels in the history of war. It has been said of him, as was first said of Alexander, and afterwards of the Black Prince, that he fought no battle which he did not win, sat down before no fortress which he did not take. The same has since been again said of the Duke of Wellington; and, without pausing to enquire how far it was absolutely true in any one of these instances, we know of no other general

to whom the saying could possibly be applied. Such unvarying success speaks of higher qualities than those of the mere commander. It speaks of the calm dispassionate judgment, quick to decide on the possibilities of any undertaking, as well as of the skill rightly to conduct the execution of it. It speaks also of the excellence of the tools with which they had to work, and persuades us that the quaint and bombastic pride of our fathers was not altogether wrong when it boasted that of all ancient heroes, Hercules, or Alexander, or Miltiades, none could compare with the British grenadier, at sight of whom

‘The God of War is pleased, and famed Bellona smiles.’

We are, however, frequently reminded of the fact that comparatively few of Marlborough's soldiers were English. This is undoubtedly true: at Blenheim, where the allied army was about 52,000 strong, there were not more than 10,000 English; and this proportion was probably never much exceeded in any of Marlborough's battles. None the less, we think the sense of the country was not wrong in speaking of the army as English, and in holding that the victories were England's. It was not only that a very large part of the army was paid or subsidised by England, that its head and chief was an Englishman, that without Marlborough the coalition would inevitably have fallen to pieces; but that the English soldiers were, physically at least, superior to their fellows, that the English regiments quickly became distinguished from all others by their steadiness and discipline, and, by their example and the confidence which that example gave, supported and strengthened the whole. The continental armies were not yet levied by conscription, and their ranks were filled, literally, with the dregs of the population. Dr. Burton is mistaken in supposing that the conscription existed in France under Louis XIV.; it was introduced by the French Revolution. In material comfort, and in the bone and muscle which good feeding gives, the English peasant was very far in advance of the peasant of either France or Germany.

At the peace of Ryswick the English army had been disbanded. Of the soldiers who had fought under William, only 10,000 were kept with the colours; and the number was afterwards reduced to 7,000. When war again broke out, the work of recruiting had to be begun anew. No doubt many of the old soldiers fell in at the first beat of the drum: we have no means of saying how many; but to those who have once grown familiar with the sound there is in it an attraction

impossible to resist; and the men who had fought not ingloriously at Steinkirk and Landen, or who had stormed the palisades of Namur, were not likely to be less alive to its magic. But to raise recruits by tens of thousands was then, as it always has been, a task of great difficulty; and though some were obtained from the debtors' prison, some few also from the felons' gaol, the number of these was both absolutely and relatively small.

The large towns had not yet received that impulse which has since spread them over so much of England; manufactures had not increased the country's wealth, at the expense, it is to be feared, of the stature, and lungs, and muscles of the working class; agriculture was still the principal industry; and, from mere force of numbers, the ranks of the army must have been mainly filled with agricultural labourers. Vagrants and vagabonds, peasants of doubtful character, lads in trouble or crossed in love, country bumpkins—such as Farquhar has described pocketing the queen's picture, set in gold, and bearing the posy *Ca-ro-lus*, the Latin for Queen Anne—fellows with heavy hands and stout hearts, even though their heads might be of the weakest, made up the staple of the recruits, were forthwith shipped off to Flanders, and from the drill sergeant's crucible were turned out the finest soldiers that the world had seen—men that not only could, but did, go anywhere, and do anything that was required of them.

Although Dr. Burton has allotted but a small proportion of his work to military operations, he appears to us to relate them with truth and spirit. He has evidently visited the spots famous for the great battles of the war; the lines of Schellenberg, the field of Blenheim, the woods which screened the advancing forces at Ramillies, have never been described with more effect or precision. These, in fact, are the most graphic pages of his book; and the details more interesting to a military student may be found in Cox's 'Life of Marlborough,' and in the magnificent publication of General Pélet's campaigns of the War of Succession, in eleven quarto volumes, which we owe to the French Government.

Of the wonderful man who guided the allied armies to victory, space would fail us, did we wish to speak at fitting length. The savage attack of Macaulay, the no less savage attack of Thackeray, has stamped the weak points of Marlborough's character deep into our memories. It is not possible for anyone to forget the blots which they have shown us through a too powerful magnifying glass—to forget that

love of money was with him, more even than with most men, a spur to action, to enterprise, and to genius; that in an age when every politician was a jobber and intriguer, he too jobbed and intrigued; that when every man in office endeavoured to secure his career and his life against the possibilities of revolution, he too did the same, with greater audacity, with greater genius, perhaps even with greater wickedness than others. But when all is said that can be said, with the allegation of the treachery at Brest fresh in our memory, we still maintain that, throughout, Marlborough's treasons were offences against the king—James, or William, or George—not breaches of his allegiance to England. How thoroughly the age could and did discriminate, we may judge from the words attributed to Admiral Russell, himself as double-dealing a traitor as any of his contemporaries. 'I wish'—he is reported to have said to the emissary of the banished monarch—'I wish to serve King James. But do not think that I will let the French triumph over us in our own sea. If I meet them, I fight them—ay, though his Majesty himself should be on board.' And on this followed the battle of Barfleur and the destruction of the French ships at La Hogue. Some such treason was that of Marlborough. That, throughout the reign of William, he had correspondence with James, we know; we know, also, that towards the end of Anne's life he was in friendly correspondence with James's son; and that, even during the time of his greatness, he was careful to show him all possible respect. In this he was craftily providing for possible changes which he could not control; as his brother, the admiral, might have said, he was laying out an anchor to windward. But the idea of treason, such as we now understand it, is untenable. The treason that, irrespective of words written or spoken, in deeds took such form as Blenheim or Ramillies, that captured towns by the dozen, overthrew the marshals of France one after the other, and annihilated the French armies as fast as they could be levied—such treason is not hateful to us; and when our soldiers again stand face to face with those of our country's enemies, we can wish them nothing better than to have at their head another such traitor.

But even Marlborough's military genius has been pressed into the service against him. He has been accused of needlessly prolonging the war in order to win, not so much glory, as the emoluments which accrued to the commander-in-chief. Of this we do not believe a word. Marlborough's greed for money was no doubt great, and his emoluments were enormous. It was stated that his legitimate income, during the

later years of his command, amounted to upwards of 54,000*l.*, and this was no doubt largely increased in many unacknowledged ways. Such sums must have been a powerful temptation to an avaricious man; but there is no evidence that he yielded to it, and his most private letters to the Duchess repeatedly convey his ardent desire for peace and a home life. Again, it has been bitterly enough alleged and frequently repeated that he fought the battle of Malplaquet for no military reason, but solely in order to strengthen the hands of his party at home. The facts lend no support to such an assertion. More than two years before, he had written that if the French put themselves on the defensive, 'we shall be under a necessity of opening the campaign with the siege of Tournay or Mons.' The operations which he had thus sketched out for 1707 were, in fact, those of 1709.

When the campaign opened, the French army, under Marshal de Villars, had taken up an entrenched position between Douay and Bethune, so as to oppose any contemplated invasion of France on that side. Against this the allied generals made a feint, intending, possibly, to push it into an attack, should it appear feasible; but when Villars, to strengthen his defences, had denuded Tournay of half its garrison, they suddenly swept round and invested that place. Villars, whose army was largely composed of newly raised men, made no attempt to relieve it, and, believing that the ultimate design of the enemy was to enter France, continued strengthening and extending his lines. After about a month, Tournay capitulated; the citadel held out a month longer, when it too surrendered, and the allies immediately pushed on towards Mons. If Mons fell, the French position was turned; and Villars, in council with Boufflers, who, though his senior, had volunteered to serve under his orders, determined to move for its protection. Of Villars's advance Marlborough and Eugene had immediate knowledge. They went to meet him, and on September 9 the two armies were in front of each other. It is said that Marlborough wished to engage on the 10th; but the Dutch deputies were opposed to his doing so, and Eugene declared in favour of waiting till the full strength of the army came up from Tournay. The French were equal in numbers to the allies; but Villars judged that defensive war was his proper strategy, and took advantage of the delay to entrench his position, in which he waited the attack. 'We have still to fight against moles,' growled our soldiers, as, with unpleasant memories of the siege of Tournay, they advanced against the enemy on the morning of the 11th. The position was strong, and gave

confidence to the new levies of the French, who fought with determination, and were not driven out till after a bloody and obstinate battle, in which, through the untimely impetuosity of the Prince of Orange, the loss of the allies was considerably in excess of that of the French. Villars, who was himself seriously wounded, wrote to the king: 'If God, in His goodness, should vouchsafe to us to lose such another battle, your Majesty may consider your enemies annihilated.' Marlborough took a different view. 'God Almighty be praised'—he wrote to the duchess on the evening of the same day—'it is now in our power to have what peace we please; and I may be pretty well assured of never being in another battle;' and, two days later, to Mr. Stanhope, the English Minister at the Hague: 'I hope it will conduce to the putting a speedy and happy issue to the war, to the general satisfaction of all the allies.' He immediately laid siege to Mons, which the French, now under Boufflers and Berwick, were unable to relieve; it capitulated on October 20, and, the weather having set in very wet, the army went into winter quarters.

The events of the campaign had thus closely followed the forecast of the French standing on the defensive, which Marlborough had made nearly three years before; and we cannot but judge those writers to be still ignorant of the circumstances, who repeat the allegation which a shameless and virulent party spirit made at the time. It had been decided that the war was to be continued; and on that decision Malplaquet followed in necessary course. If, therefore, any blame attaches to Marlborough for fighting at Malplaquet, it is really for his share in the rejection of the overtures made by the French king during the early months of 1709. And it is of this that he has been most seriously accused. The abortive negotiations, known as the Conferences of the Hague, which were followed in 1710 by the Conference of Gertruydenberg, have thus a very important bearing on our estimate of Marlborough and the war policy of which he was the agent; and we cannot but regret that Dr. Burton has judged it consistent with his idea of a history of the reign of Queen Anne to pass them over with a bare mention.

In truth, these Conferences were the most important diplomatic incidents in the whole course of the war. The details given us in Torcy's *Memoirs* are extremely interesting, and we hold that it was a fatal error on the part of the allies not then and there to have concluded a peace which would have secured to them everything worth fighting for. The fact is that Louis, compelled to admit, even to

himself, the pressure at once of the war, of a most severe winter, and of a starving people, had endeavoured to obtain at least a breathing time, and had attempted, in the first place, by particular negotiations and concessions, to detach the Dutch from the alliance. In vain. During the preceding forty years the Dutch had too often felt the heel of the French king to be disposed now to loosen the death-grip which the allies had fixed on him. They would stand or fall with the common cause. The petty German States were equally firm. The Emperor, represented by Eugene, would have nothing short of the abdication of the Spanish throne by the Duke of Anjou. The English were steadfast and true. The French had, in the previous summer, attempted an invasion of Scotland in support of the Pretender; and Marlborough was instructed to insist, in addition to the joint demands, on the recognition of Queen Anne and the Protestant succession, on the sending the Pretender out of France, and on the demolition of the fortifications and harbour of Dunkirk. These points were conceded, and the further conditions were none of Marlborough's; neither was it on them that the negotiation broke down, but on the demand of the Alliance that the French king should advise his grandson to leave Spain, and even, in case of necessity, turn the armies of France against him. That was a humiliation to which, as M. de Torcy fairly warned the Allies, Louis XIV. neither could nor would submit, and he did not submit to it. But that Marlborough strenuously endeavoured to carry the negotiations to a successful end is indubitable. He protested his sincerity—too vehemently, thought De Torcy. He was profuse in his good wishes to France and the Chevalier; he endeavoured to persuade De Torcy to accept the terms; but he would give up nothing. Personally, indeed, he held that the demands on the French king as to the French prince being forced to leave Spain were—not excessive, but—needless. On May 27, he had written to Mr. Stanhope:—

‘We still may meet with some difficulties about the Duke of Anjou's evacuating Spain; but when the French have delivered us all the cautionary towns, and complied with everything else on this side, we shall have the better end of the staff, and be more able to force them.’

And in a private note to Godolphin, of June 16, just before the negotiations were broken off:—

‘I have as much mistrust for the sincerity of France as anybody living can have; but I will own to you that, in my opinion, if France had delivered the towns promised by the preliminaries, and demolished Dunkirk and the other towns mentioned, they must have been at our dis-

cretion, so that if they had played tricks, so much the worse for themselves. But I do not love to be singular, especially when it was doing what France seemed to desire.' *

He insisted, therefore, on the demand. 'Be assured,' he said to De Torcy, 'that you must yield to us every single portion of the Spanish monarchy.' De Torcy, or rather the French king, urged by exaggerated reports of Marlborough's besetting infirmity, attempted to bribe him. He offered him two millions, nay, four millions of livres, for more favourable terms. The insult did not disturb Marlborough's outward equanimity, and does not seem to have affected his conduct one way or the other. His slanderers have said that he would have liked the money well enough, but it would not have compensated him for his appointments; we know of nothing which shows that Marlborough would not have preferred the interests of his country to any bribe the French king could have offered. That eventually the negotiations broke down, that Louis refused to comply with the demands of the allies, and that the war resumed its course—these are the crimes of which Marlborough has been accused, without, so far as the circumstances are before us, the shadow of a reason.

But, to understand the virulent hate with which Marlborough was pursued, it is necessary to examine into the relations of the great political parties, the keynote to the whole political system during the reign of Anne. In this Dr. Burton has, we think, missed his opportunity. He does not seem to have grasped the national importance of these party squabbles and party intrigues, nor to have realised the power which backstairs influences may have over a queen, herself the head of the Government, when that queen is a weak-minded yet obstinate woman. He has thus passed slightly over the intrigue by which Abigail Hill—whose name has engrafted itself on the English language as the synonym of a waiting-woman—supplanted the Duchess of Marlborough in the Queen's favour; and refuses to admit the share in that intrigue which has been commonly attributed to Harley. He says:—

'It is not easy to pronounce on the charges against Harley, but they certainly bear faint resemblance to the tone of his general character. He was in most things a man scrupulous in his actions, whatever his thoughts may have been. He was generally trusted, and if there was anything to suggest misgivings it was in the impenetrable reserve that, even when the haze of inebriety loosened his tongue, sometimes in a wildish manner, about trifles, enabled him to keep dead silence on affairs

* Coxe's 'Life of Marlborough,' vol. ii. p. 409. (Bohn's Edition.)

of moment. His inscrutability let imaginations and tongues loose on his character and actions.'

And again :—

'That Robert Harley was by nature a cunning man, and in practice what is colloquially called a tricky man, or a trickster, is a doctrine as deeply rooted in historical opinion as the military skill of Marlborough and the oratorical accomplishments of Bolingbroke. It is useless to contradict the opinion, because it cannot be disproved. But a consciousness of this opens up the question, how far the opinion, so confidently adopted, is capable of proof, since it is the property of a wisely cunning nature to keep the nature itself a secret?'

This craving for exact evidence in matters of historical research may easily be carried too far; and is, in the present instance, as unreasonable as it is to throw doubt on that 'mysterious glory' which haunts Bolingbroke's reputation as an orator, because 'we are not able to test the accuracy of 'the eulogiums on his speeches, since not a genuine morsel of 'them remains.' But the same might be said of most of the great parliamentary orators of the last two centuries; and we incline to believe that we have, in fact, the same kind of evidence as to Bolingbroke or Harley that we have as to Marlborough. We have the evidence of those who were tricked or deluded by the one, of those who listened with rapt attention to the other; and what further evidence have we of Marlborough's genius than the testimony of the people he saved or of the foes he overthrew? The Duchess of Marlborough has herself left us a detailed account of Harley's tortuous and slippery ways, which is either true or a jumble of stupid and unmeaning falsehoods; but the duchess was far indeed from being a stupid woman, or one likely to tell falsehoods without an object; and Ralph, the pamphleteer, who undertook to answer her, could only say, 'That Mr. Harley made use of 'the Heifer occasionally, according to the phrase of those 'times, is, I believe, scarce to be disputed.' Macaulay has summed up his description of Harley with the opinion that he was 'a dull puzzle-headed man,' a character not out of keeping with his having abundance of that low cunning which would consider the intrigues of the palace backstairs a triumph of statesmanship. We are, therefore, quite ready to adopt the received opinion that it was this intrigue which rendered Harley unacceptable to Marlborough and Godolphin; which led them to insist on his resignation of office, for which the discovery of his clerk's treason lent a colour; which thus rendered Harley in turn more bitter and more cunning, and

finally enabled him to break down the long and glorious ministry of which Godolphin was the nominal head.

This, however, was only the climax. There is no doubt whatever that the Government had been gradually losing its hold on the affections of the people; that after the battle of Ramillies, May 23, 1706, the peace party, originally consisting of the ultra-Tories, had received and continued to receive large accessions. It was argued that the aggressive power of France was broken; that the question of who should rule in Spain was of no importance in England; and that the continuance of the war would serve no English ends. The war was, no doubt, oppressive, and just at that time was especially so felt by reason of the stagnation in trade and of 'the losses ' that had been sustained at sea by inefficiency of convoy.'

These had been considerable, and were by no means the only instances of the mismanagement and misconduct of naval affairs. The navy, in regard to which the country has always been most sensitive, was the weak point of the Godolphin administration, although, in fact, it was to a great extent beyond the control of the ministry. For on the accession of the Queen, her husband, Prince George, had been appointed Lord High Admiral; and he continued to hold the office until his death in 1708. Prince George was a good-humoured, easy-tempered, man of neither parts nor energy, in whose hands things were left to shift very much for themselves, or were driven this way or that according to the caprice of the moment, or the passing influence of one or other of his advisers. And his rule at the Admiralty began with a shame and disaster unparalleled in our annals, for which, indeed, he was in no way responsible, but which none the less throws its darkening shadow over his period of office.

On the threatened outbreak of hostilities in 1701, Vice-Admiral Benbow had been sent, for a second time, to the West Indies, in command of a large squadron. In August, 1702, 'being informed that M. du Casse—the French admiral—' was gone to Cartagena and bound thence to Porto Bello, 'he resolved to sail to that coast with two third and four ' fourth rates, and on the 19th, in the evening, discovered ' ten sail near Santa Marta. Standing towards them he soon ' found the greatest part were French ships of war.' So says Burchett, who was at the time Secretary to the Admiralty. Dr. Burton's account is curiously inaccurate, not only as to the nautical details, but as to simple matters of fact. August, for instance, cannot, with any propriety, be called winter; nor can Santa Marta be said to be among the

West Indian Islands. That Benbow, on making out the enemy, steered towards them and engaged, but was not supported by the ships of his squadron, and was left almost by himself, is too sadly true. But Dr. Burton has missed what is the most extraordinary feature of the case—that the action did not end, as he implies, at nightfall, but continued, off and on, for six days, during which Benbow hung on to the enemy, vainly trying to shame the captains of his ships into doing their duty. It was not till the sixth day that Benbow was wounded; that the captains assembled on board the flagship—the ‘Breda’—and advised him against continuing the fight; and it was after this meeting that, in a last attempt, the ‘Breda’ was disabled, when the French retired leisurely and unopposed. On returning to Jamaica Benbow ordered a court martial to be held on the several captains of the squadron. One of them died before the trial; two—Kirby and Wade—were sentenced to be shot, and were shot; one was cashiered and sentenced to be imprisoned during the Queen’s pleasure; the others were suspended. The admiral himself died of his wound on November 4. Dr. Burton finds it ‘difficult to avoid a suspicion that the mutineer captains were Jacobites, plotting to ‘place their vessels in the hands of France.’ For this there are no grounds whatever; nor, does Campbell, to whom he refers, suggest it. What Campbell does say is that

‘the admiral was an honest rough seaman,’ and had treated ‘Captain Kirby and the rest of the gentlemen a little briskly at Jamaica, when he found them not quite so ready to obey his orders as he thought was their duty; and this it was that engaged them in the base and wicked design of putting it out of his power to engage the French; presuming that, as so many were concerned in it, they might be able to justify themselves, and throw the blame upon the admiral, and so they hoped to be rid of him.’

And we believe this to be the real explanation of this disgraceful affair. The fact, as it appears to us, is that Benbow’s obstinate pluck and death have veiled his faults; and we can conceive Kirby and the other mutineers, who were men of good family, to have been intensely irritated by their admiral’s disregard of the ordinary courtesies of society. Neither can we think that Benbow was free from blame in his conduct of the action; for, finding, as he certainly did on the second day, that his captains were cowards, mutineers, conspirators, or traitors—it matters not which—it was his duty to supersede them; ‘he ought,’ Burchett thinks, ‘to have summoned them on board his own ship and there confined them, and placed their first lieutenants in their rooms, who would have fought well, were it for no

'other reason than the hopes of being continued in those 'commands, had they survived.' That the French have spoken of this as a brilliant action and a glorious victory, is to us a small matter; had it been so, our shame would have been less. But, such as it was, the advantage was undoubtedly theirs, and we cannot deny, though we may try to explain away, the fact that Benbow was beaten off by Du Casse.*

Still, neither the appointment of Benbow nor of his captains was the work of Queen Anne's Admiralty; and in Europe the naval war was not at first unsatisfactory. The projected attack on Cadiz, in 1702, failed rather through the incompetence of the Duke of Ormond in command of the land forces; and the failure there was hidden in the success at Vigo, where the brilliant achievement of Hopson threw a lustre over his plebeian name. But the havoc wrought by the storm that 'o'er pale Britannia passed,' on November 26-7, 1703, came more directly home to the knowledge and feelings of the people. Afloat, as ashore, the destruction was such as in England had never been heard of. Ships of the line, torn from their anchors, were tossed on the beach as if they had been so many cock-boats; 'the coasts,' says Chamberlen, 'were, in a 'manner, covered with the wrecks of ships.' Dr. Burton—whose account of this 'egregious elemental riot' will scarcely be accepted by our meteorologists—has given us an interesting letter of Sir George Rooke, from the Hague, till now unpublished.

'The storm,' it says, 'drove the "Vigo," "Rochester," "Swan," and "Newport," with about twenty of the transport ships, ashore in the country, where some of them will never get off. It put the "Vigo" upon the west pier-head at Hielvoetsluys, when the men had just time to save their lives, and down she sunk. The rest of her Majesty's ships are got off and safe. . . . The poor Prince of Hesse Darmstadt has lost all his servants but five, and all he has in the world, in a ship driven out of the Downs and lost upon the Ely Island [Heligoland], on the north coast of this country.'

Parliament hastened to send an address to the Queen and to vote supplies for replacing the lost ships; but there are always many to whom a misfortune is a fault, and amongst these the blame of the disaster fell on the Admiralty.

We are now accustomed to refer to the capture of Gibraltar, in 1704, as the principal success won by our sailors during

* 'L'Amiral du Casse, Chevalier de la Toison d'Or.' Par le Baron Robert du Casse. 8vo. Paris: 1876.

the War of the Succession; but at the time, this, though really a dashing enterprise, was thought little of, whilst the battle off Malaga, now barely remembered, was spoken of in terms of very exaggerated praise, and rated far above Blenheim by the opponents of the Government, who insisted on Rooke's name being joined to that of Marlborough in the vote of thanks. It was probably this exaggeration which caused, by a pardonable reaction, the battle of Malaga to be lightly esteemed and then forgotten; for the battle itself was a creditable affair; and though the French, by the skilful use of defensive tactics, then, as many times afterwards, preserved themselves from rout, they were so far worsted that they retired to Toulon without making the intended attempt on Gibraltar. Had the English been defeated, Gibraltar would certainly have been recaptured: it must, therefore, be considered the prize of victory; and it remained, as it still remains, with the English.

But after the check which the French fleet then sustained, it became the naval policy of France rather to prey on English commerce than to contest the seas with equal forces; so that whilst our grand fleets, under Shovel or Leake, were all-powerful in the Mediterranean, small French squadrons and isolated cruisers, issuing from Dunkirk, St. Malo, or Brest, were the scourge of the Channel. Of these cruisers and corsairs there were three—Bart, Forbin, and Duguay-Trouin—who won a distinct reputation in France, where they are still acknowledged as typical naval heroes. Forbin was a man of good family, claiming kindred with the Scotch house of Forbes, and a trained officer of the king's navy; but his career had been, throughout, wild and adventurous, if we may believe even a fraction of the memoirs written from his own notes. Bart and Duguay-Trouin, on the other hand, began life as merchant seamen or privateers, and received a royal commission only at an advanced period. But all were undoubtedly men of ability and enterprise, though, from the nature and manner of their warfare, their successes were for the most part achieved against mere merchant ships, or convoys of very inferior force. Still, these successes were more than respectable, including—as they did on May 1, 1707—the capture, by the squadron under Forbin, of two ships of 70 guns, and a large number of merchant ships which they were unable to protect; or an affair such as that on October 10 of the same year, when a squadron, consisting mostly of frigates and smaller vessels, commanded by Forbin and Duguay-Trouin together, attacked a fleet of some 130 merchant ships under

convoy of two ships of 80 guns, one of 76, and two of 50; a force which should, and with due care might, have repelled the joint attack of all the French ships of war or privateers in the Channel. But they allowed themselves to be scattered and destroyed piecemeal. The two 50-gun ships and one of the 80's were captured; the other 80 was set on fire and blown up; the 'Royal Oak,' of 76 guns, having again, as on May 1, the questionable fortune to escape. It was thus, for once, not altogether without reason that on November 9, in the debate in the House of Lords on the state of the Navy, Lord Haversham said: 'Your disasters at sea have been so many, a man scarce knows where to begin. Your ships have been taken by your enemies, as the Dutch take your herrings, by shoals, upon your own coasts; nay, your Royal Navy itself has not escaped. These are pregnant misfortunes, and big with innumerable mischiefs.'

Lord Haversham's statements could not be controverted: the convoys of merchant ships were notoriously ineffective; and no brilliant success showed that the country was, in any other way, well served afloat. Ships were built freely; it appears that between 1702 and 1712—we believe, indeed, before 1709—forty-seven ships of the line were built to replace the sixteen that had been lost, captured, or destroyed. So far the administration was abundantly effective; but there were continual complaints that these ships, when in commission, were never in the right place, so that, with a navy numerically far inferior, the French were still able to appear at their points of attack in superior force. It was said, too, that in 1708, when it was known that the Pretender was going to attempt a landing in Scotland, Sir George Byng had so posted his squadron off Dunkirk as to permit the French under Forbin to slip out and reach the Forth, in time, too, to have landed their men and stores, had they been met, as they expected, by a responsive population. That Byng followed close in their wake, hurried them out of the Firth, and captured one of their ships, seemed a small thing in comparison with his having permitted them, in the first instance, to leave Dunkirk. In fact, the naval operations throughout—the relief of Barcelona in 1706, or the destruction of some twenty of the enemy's ships of war at Toulon in 1707—were important in their results rather than brilliant in the popular estimation; whilst the capture of convoys in the Channel, the loss of Sir Cloudesley Shovel among the Scilly Islands, or the appearance of a hostile squadron on the coast of Scotland, were to every petty squire or to every shopkeeper in the country so many

convincing proofs that the navy of England was 'in a parlous state.'

To others capable of taking a wider view of passing events, the course of the war in Spain seemed eminently unsatisfactory. It was Spain that the quarrel nominally most concerned; it was to Spain that very large numbers of English soldiers had been sent; and nobody could hear that King Charles was a whit nearer being acknowledged by the Spanish people than he was at the beginning. In Catalonia, or in the heart of the army, he might masquerade as a monarch and assume the airs of an autocrat; but throughout the peninsula he was nothing better than one of a hated swarm of invaders. The army, too, was unfortunate in its generals. The Prince of Hesse Darmstadt, the Earl of Galway, Stanhope or Staremborg, though men of courage and conduct, were all utterly wanting in genius; whilst the Earl of Peterborough, with all the brilliancy, had the eccentricity of a meteor, and was as little to be relied on; nor was he much regretted when he disappeared, after capturing Barcelona, scouring the country at the head of a few irregulars, quarrelling with everybody round him, and interfering in everybody's business—as when, years before, whilst serving as a lieutenant on board the 'Bristol,' he wished to usurp the chaplain's duties and preach the Sunday's sermon.* Of his German colleague, Prince Lichtenstein, he wrote, his character 'is such as would scarce be believed were it not so universally known. His falsehood, his pride, his greediness for money, I shall not so much insist on; but his meddling with everything and understanding nothing must bring us to ruin.' The Spaniard, the Conde de Cesuentes, fares no better at his hands; he is described as, 'in a word, the Lord Pembroke of Spain, a Spanish bully without any experience of business, having no money, but all the pride of his country.' We may gather that he was no more backward at speaking than at writing his opinion.

'Peterborough,' wrote Godolphin to Marlborough, in August, 1706, 'has written a volume to Mr. Secretary Hedges. It is a sort of remonstrance against the King of Spain and his ministers in the first place, and secondly a complaint against all the orders and directions sent from hence, and as if he had not authority enough given him either at sea or land. In a word, he is both useless and grievous there, and is preparing to be as troublesome here whenever he is called home.'†

* 'Diary of Henry Teonge,' November 3, 1678.

† Marlborough Despatches, vol. iii. p. 125 n.

We think that Peterborough is, in popular estimation, a much-overrated man. In sudden and bold enterprise he has rarely been equalled, never perhaps surpassed; but for the carrying out of lengthened operations and the dull necessities of routine he was altogether unfitted. Dr. Burton has well described him as 'a man who could be of no use unless he had 'absolutely his own way;' and again as one whose 'motions and achievements have a close analogy to those of a clever stage manager.' His art of war was 'the playing off of 'hoaxes or practical jokes on a great and bloody scale; a 'thing that may be done once or twice while there is surprise, 'confusion, and ignorance. . . . But no one makes real progress in life by such tricks, and so Peterborough did not 'succeed in establishing a dynasty,' or, in fact, 'in anything 'save furnishing the world with a brilliantly acted romance.' He owed much of the reputation he acquired in the Spanish war to the inimitable pen of Defoe, who gave to our literature in the 'Memoirs of Captain Carleton' the most brilliant narrative of that war, and a work of fiction which imposed on Dr. Johnson himself as a veracious history. When Peterborough left, the prospects of the allies in Spain were sufficiently dark; they rapidly became worse; and though the war, with varying success, dragged along for years, they never recovered from the defeat at Almanza on April 25, 1707.

There was thus, scattered through the country, much discontent with the conduct of the war, as well as much dissatisfaction at its continuance. But to those of high rank, who considered the offices of the State as to some extent their birthright, the all-pervading influence of Marlborough had become a personal and by no means disinterested grievance. It was perhaps natural that he should have the entire control of the army; but under the weak and indolent Prince of Denmark, Marlborough's brother, Admiral Churchill, was, or was supposed to be, virtually the head of the navy. At the Treasury, Godolphin was bound to him by very close family ties; the principal Secretary of State, the Earl of Sunderland, was his son-in-law; and, more than all, the Duchess of Marlborough was the friend and confidante of the Queen, over whose weak mind her strong intellect and commanding temper tyrannised rather than ruled. But the effect of all this was that the prizes at the disposal of the Government fell to the partisans of the house of Churchill, and those outside that family circle felt aggrieved and injured at their exclusion. When, therefore, it was understood that the

Queen, supported by Mistress Hill, now Lady Masham, and by Harley, was rebelling against the tyranny of the too powerful Duchess, the sympathies of the malcontents were at once enlisted in favour of the rising party, who, so far at least as their chiefs were concerned, claimed to be Tories, mainly because their adversaries were known as Whigs; and were in favour of a peace because their adversaries were the advocates of a war policy. These gave vigour and impulse to the old genuine Tory party, who, from conviction, favoured the pretensions of the exiled House of Stuart, and loathed the war, whose every success rendered a counter revolution more and more improbable.

Things were in this state, tending to produce that even balance between contending parties which is destructive to efficient government, when the ministry—or rather Godolphin, contrary to the wishes of his colleagues—determined on a measure which would test their relative strength by ensuring the fullest possible muster of their opponents. This was the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell for preaching and publishing a sermon in which the doctrine of non-resistance was put prominently forward, and—by implication—the principles of the revolution were condemned. Somers, perhaps the truest Whig of the party, would have let this pass unnoticed; Marlborough would have let the law take its ordinary course, that Sacheverell be tried before one of the judges and sentenced to stand in the pillory or to pay a fine. Godolphin, urged, it may be, by personal feeling, unwisely insisted on the impeachment; and Sacheverell was therefore formally impeached before the House of Lords ‘of high crimes and misdemeanours.’ In the account of this celebrated trial Dr. Burton has put out his full strength; but whilst we acknowledge the interest of the narrative, we cannot but think that he has overrated the importance of its subject, and, from an artistic point of view, has erred in treating it at such great length. In a few words the case was this. On November 5, 1709, Dr. Sacheverell, a man of fair fame as a pulpit orator, was appointed to preach the anniversary sermon in St. Paul’s. This he did on the text, 2 Corinthians xi. 26, ‘In perils among false brethren.’ The false brethren were, according to the preacher, those who, with the Government, supported ‘occasional conformity,’ which he characterised as ‘this scandalous fluctuation and trimming betwixt the Church and Dissenters,’ as ‘spiritual legerdemain,’ ‘fallacious trickery and double dealing’ which would necessarily ‘eradicate all the principles of truth and honesty or piety out of men’s minds.’

But the burden of offence is to be found in such sentences as these:—

‘The grand security of our government, and the very pillar upon which it stands, is founded upon the steady belief of the subject’s obligation to an absolute and unconditional obedience to the supreme power in all things lawful, and the utter illegality of resistance on any pretence whatsoever. . . . Our adversaries think they effectually stop our mouths when they urge the Revolution of this day in their defence. But certainly they are the greatest enemies of that and of his late Majesty, and the most ungrateful for the deliverance, who endeavour to cast such black and odious colours upon both. How often must they be told that the king himself solemnly disclaimed the least imputation of resistance in his declaration, and that the Parliament declared that they set the crown on his head upon no other title but that of the vacancy of the throne.’

For promulgating such opinions, Sacheverell was impeached; and during three weeks the case was argued before the House of Lords, from February 27, 1710, to March 20—not October—when the question was put as to whether Dr. Sacheverell was guilty or not guilty of high crimes and misdemeanours, and was answered in the affirmative by a majority of sixty-nine to fifty-two. The next day judgment was passed. The preacher was suspended for three years, and the printed sermon was ordered to be ‘burnt before the Royal Exchange in London, ‘between the hours of twelve and one, on Monday; the 27th ‘day of this instant March, by the hands of the common ‘hangman, in the presence of the Lord Mayor of the City of ‘London and the two sheriffs of London and Middlesex.’ Considering the formidable and weighty apparatus that had been set in motion for the trial, the punishment was generally thought to be trifling. It has been said that the Government was deeply mortified. Dr. Burton, writing with a familiar knowledge of the Godolphin papers, says, ‘I have noticed no ‘stronger symptom of this than a slight growl from Godol- ‘phin;’ but some expressions in Godolphin’s published correspondence go rather beyond this. On March 20, writing to Marlborough, he says: ‘It is very well the session is so near ‘an end; for otherwise the folly of some few, and the villany ‘of a great many, would make things extremely uneasy.’ And again on the 21st: ‘All this bustle and fatigue ends in ‘no more but a suspension of three years from the pulpit, and ‘burning his sermon at the old Exchange. The conjunction ‘of the Duke of Somerset and Lord Rivers with the Duke of ‘Argyle and his brother, the Earl of Islay, has been the great ‘occasion of this disappointment.’ *

* Coxe’s ‘Life of Marlborough,’ vol. iii. p. 25.

But the real significance of the affair, and it was great, was that it marked the decline of the ministry, or—as Boyer puts it—‘the impotence of the Whig party.’ The Queen, too, was said to have felt injured by the tone in which her succession had been spoken of. As far as her weak intellect was capable of entertaining a principle, she believed in the divine right by which she ruled. Resistance might, under the circumstances, be lawful against her father; against herself it would be a damnable sin. And yet these rude Whigs had spoken as if she had come to, and now sat on, the throne by the mere favour of the Parliament. She was a Stuart, the sister of the exiled Prince; and though her affection for him was but feeble, her dislike to the very name of Hanover was strong. If James would but avow himself a member of the Church of England, the detested German might be kept out of the country. She does not seem to have been aware that this condition was peremptorily rejected by the Pretender himself, who refused to change his religion for a crown; and in the later years of her reign the Queen was certainly favourable to a second Stuart restoration. There could be little difficulty in it, if only the administration was in friendly hands; but, under a Whig Government, nothing could be done. Such ideas, carefully nursed by Lady Masham; such arguments, urged in a proper way and at the proper time, confirmed her antipathies and won her assent. Within six months she wrote to Godolphin, abruptly dismissing him from office; she would not even see him. ‘I desire,’ she said, ‘that instead of bringing the staff to me, you will break it;’ and the letter, dated August 7, was sent the following day by a servant in livery.

So ended the Godolphin administration—an administration which during eight years had splendidly, and for the most part nobly, upheld the interests of England on the Continent; by a wise and liberal policy at home had soothed the fury of religious strife; and by its system of finance had preserved the sympathy and support of the great merchants and capitalists throughout a period of great difficulty and taxation. Dr. Burton goes so far as to assert that Godolphin was ‘the greatest master of finance and pecuniary economy that ever held rule in Britain;’ but he only supports this opinion by a reference to the ‘Calendar of Treasury Papers,’ recently published.* We cannot accept so broad a statement without

* We have had the curiosity to peruse this volume of Treasury Papers. It contains proof of Godolphin’s assiduity in attending to the current business of the office, but none at all of financial ability.

much fuller evidence, which we do not find in these volumes. The truth we believe rather to be that Godolphin adopted the Dutch system of carrying on war by loans, and was the chief founder of our National Debt; and after his fall it was found that the 'Tallies' (as they were called) to the amount of ten millions were unprovided for, and that the naval and military contracts had been made on ruinous terms. But Godolphin's most solid claim to our respect and esteem is perhaps the having carried through the union with Scotland—a union so thoroughly perfected that it is now only by an effort we can conceive a time when the English and the Scotch were two peoples with opposing interests or even with opposing armies.

From the accession of James I. to the throne of England, a union—a complete incorporation—was a favourite project of that sovereign; it had been revived after the Restoration, and in 1670 commissioners, on the part of Scotland, were appointed to discuss it. Still the jealousies between the two peoples continued, not indeed so strong as, four or five centuries earlier, they had been between the rival seaports of England—between Yarmouth, for instance, and the Cinque Ports—but different in kind, as recognised by law, and as based on differences of customs dues. Such jealousies and rivalries, however, frequently strained the relations between the two countries; and all who merited the name of statesmen had gradually formed the resolve that they must be put an end to. The commercial and financial ruin which fell on Scotland by the failure of the Darien Expedition confirmed this. The capital subscribed, 220,000*l.*, when compared with the very limited wealth of the country, has been estimated as equivalent to more than twenty millions at the present time. It had been vain, before the expedition was fitted out, to show that it was about to violate all geographical, commercial, or international laws; it was equally vain, after the disaster, to show that it could have had no other end. It was forgotten that Admiral Benbow, by his decisive action at Cartagena in 1699, had prevented the Spaniards from crushing the infant colony; it was only remembered that the English capitalists had withheld their money, and that the English Government had withheld its support. The feeling ran extremely high; nor was it altogether unanswered by that of the London merchants, and more especially of the East India Company, whose privileges had been set at nought, and whose monopoly was to be invaded. These they were determined to support; and a Scotch vessel, the '*Annandale*,' bound to the East Indies, which put into the Thames, possibly from stress of

weather and need of repairs, was arrested at the suit of the East India Company. It is said that, in order to avoid any violation of the Company's privileges, it was intended that she should return to Scotland, where she would be independent of the English monopoly, and commence her voyage from thence. Of this, however, there was no evidence; and as she had been entering men in the Thames, the presumption was rather that she was on the point of sailing direct for the East Indies. She was accordingly, after a full hearing, condemned. The Scotch were intensely exasperated, not only by the loss, which was considerable, but by what was held to be a national insult. Whilst they were still breathing vengeance, a ship named the 'Worcester,' homeward bound from the East Indies, was driven by foul weather into the Forth, and was there seized by way of reprisals. The 'Worcester' did not belong to the East India Company, but to a company of 'interlopers;' but this did not, in the opinion of the Scotch, make any difference. As Dr. Burton describes it—

'The affair was not a paltry rivalry among trading companies. The seizure of the "Worcester" was a blow dealt by Scotland against England. It was essentially a *casus belli*, taking that definition in its exact sense, not as a ground for declaring war, but as an act inferring the existence of war—an act such as a nation does not commit unless it is already virtually at war, whether the war has been declared or not.'

But, independent of the national question, a new complication arose. One of the Scotch company's ships, commanded by a Captain Drummond, which had sailed for the East Indies some two or three years before, had not returned. Nothing certain was heard of her, and it was said—probably as a random guess—that she had been taken by pirates, and Drummond and the crew murdered. Some of the 'Worcester's' sailors, in their cups, had been heard to talk big and boastfully—as drunken sailors will still do—of wild adventure and license in foreign parts. A suspicion arose that the 'Worcester' was really a pirate; and, after a preliminary investigation, her captain, Green by name, and fourteen officers and men of the ship's company, were brought to trial 'for the crimes of piracy, robbery, and murder.' The only positive evidence against them was that of two negroes; but on this, corroborated by the drunken talk of the seamen, the accused parties were, with one exception, severally found guilty and sentenced to be hanged. There was no proof that any murder or even piracy had been committed; it was suspected at the time, it was known afterwards, that Drummond and his fellows were living

ashore in Madagascar; but this was considered irrelevant. On pressure from England the execution was postponed for a few days. But the mob of Edinburgh insisted on justice being done; they would listen to no reason, and wanted no evidence. On April 11, 1705, the day appointed for the execution, the councillors and magistrates met in great perplexity: the people were flocking together from all quarters and seemed to threaten a dangerous tumult. Lord Seafield, the Chancellor of Scotland, wrote to Godolphin that

‘after we were some time in council, we came to be convinced that there was no possibility of preserving the public peace without allowing some that were thought most guilty to be executed; and therefore Captain Green, Captain Madder, and Simpstone, the gunner, were condescended upon, and we reprieved the rest to the 19th instant, and appointed a full council to meet on Tuesday preceding.’

The execution of these three men pacified the mob, and the rest were shortly afterwards discharged from prison.

More than a year before this, the Scotch Parliament had passed an Act for the security of the kingdom, providing that, if the Queen died without issue, her successor in Scotland should not be the same person chosen to succeed her in England, unless ‘there be such conditions of government settled and enacted ‘as may secure the honour and sovereignty of this crown and ‘kingdom . . . from English or any foreign influence.’ This of itself had established a conviction that something definite must be done, and at once; but the cruel murder of Green and his subordinates hastened the conclusion. The Queen sent a pressing message to both Parliaments, and, notwithstanding much obstruction and many delays, a joint commission was appointed, which met in London for the first time on April 16, 1706. It was at their second meeting, on April 22, that Mr. Cowper, the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal in England, formally proposed ‘that the two kingdoms of England and Scotland be for ever united into one kingdom by the name of ‘Great Britain, that the United Kingdom of Great Britain be ‘represented by one and the same Parliament, and that the ‘succession to the monarchy of the United Kingdom be’—in few words—according to the Act of Settlement. The Scotch Commissioners had some intention of proposing a federation rather than a union; but the English declared for the union, and nothing but the union. Unless that was agreed to, they would have nothing more to say to it. The Scots yielded, and on the day following—St. George’s Day—accepted the Lord Keeper’s proposals. On this solid basis the negotiation stood, though many matters of detail had to be settled—details

of trade, taxation, customs, privileges, monopolies, and these were troublesome and difficult: details of the number of members in the united Parliament: details also of heraldic honours, of the great seal, of the royal standard, of the national flag; but these, with a vague recommendation, were left to the Queen's pleasure. Finally, everything was arranged; the articles as agreed to were signed by a very large majority of the Commissioners of each nation on July 22, and, having been laid before the Queen, were submitted to the national Parliaments, in the first instance to that of Scotland.

There they were discussed, article by article. There was undoubtedly in Scotland, at that time, a strong feeling against the Union—fortunately in the minority, but still a minority both large and popular. It included the whole Jacobite party, of all shades of opinion, who saw that with the acceptance of the Union and the English Act of Settlement the possible chances of their prince beyond the sea would be almost annihilated. It included, again, the whole crowd of political jobbers and intriguers, whose vocation and opportunities would be done away with; and it included all those well-meaning but ignorant persons who fancied that the union of the two countries would be the destruction of Scotland's individuality and independence, or, with Lord Belhaven, in a still wilder flight, thought they saw 'our ancient mother, Caledonia, like Cæsar, 'sitting in the midst of our Senate, ruefully looking round 'about her, covering herself with her royal garment, attending 'the fatal blow, and breathing out her last with a *et tu quoque 'mi fili.*' This was an appeal to the outside populace, rather than to the House, which laughed at it. But in the country at large it produced a powerful effect, and stirred up the agitation of numbers who had been taught all their lives long to suspect the English, and to fear them most when offering gifts. All this was not able to upset the treaty, but it succeeded in modifying several of the articles on points to which the English seem to have attached little importance, whilst the changes soothed the jealousies or suspicions of the Scotch. And when the treaty was sent up to London, the ministers, in bringing it before Parliament, insisted on its being read as a whole: they would have no discussion of its clauses; it must be passed or rejected as it stood. It passed, and on March 6, 1707, received the royal assent. Boyer adds that the Duke of Marlborough, 'taking notice of the good humour Parliament 'was in,' thought it a proper time to get the confirmation of a grant he had lately obtained from the Queen of the royal mews, near Charing Cross, 'where a square was designed to

'be built to bear his Grace's name.' The House, however, notwithstanding its good humour, negatived the motion, and what might otherwise have been 'Marlborough Square' is now distinguished by the Nelson column, and bears the name of Nelson's greatest victory.

It is not, however, to be supposed that with the passing of the Union all opposition to it ceased. In England, indeed, it was quietly, perhaps contemptuously, accepted; but in Scotland the feelings of the people had been too violently excited. Everyone will remember how the Wizard of the North, the embodiment of the old traditions of his country, has represented Andrew Fairservice as imputing 'the accident of 'one of the horses casting his shoe to the deteriorating influence of the Union;' to which the Bailie, flourishing on 'the sugar and tobacco trade,' could only reply: 'There's naething 'sae gude on this side o' time but it might hae been better; 'and that may be said o' the Union.' And far beyond mere sentiment, the interests of the Jacobite party were too seriously at stake. It was resolved that a last effort should be made; and it would have been made in 1708, had not the too careful nurture of their prince guarded him against the ills of childhood, only that he might be laid up with the measles in his twentieth year, and at the most critical period of his life. The delay which the sickness caused rendered the plot nugatory, and an attempt which might have been most dangerous failed at the very outset. Still the agitation was kept up; and five years afterwards it was endeavoured, by an extraordinary coalition between the Jacobites and Whigs, to bring about a repeal of the Union by a vote of the United Parliament. It was on June 1, 1713, that the Earl of Finlater—himself a Whig, father of that Lord Seafield who, as Chancellor of Scotland, had had so great a share in bringing about the Union—after recapitulating sundry grievances, moved for leave to bring in a bill 'for dissolving the Union, securing the Protestant succession in the House of Hanover, and preserving 'an entire amity and good correspondence between the two 'kingdoms;' and, what now seems more extraordinary still, the motion was negatived only by a majority of three. Since that time the question has not been raised in Parliament; but two years afterwards the claims of the Pretender and of Scottish independence were defeated at Sheriffmuir, and finally crushed, thirty-one years later still, on the blood-stained heath of Culloden.

When Godolphin broke the white staff, the Treasury was put in commission. Harley was Chancellor of the Exchequer;

St. John, a so-called Tory, but at that time in all strictness a follower of Harley, and who had made common cause with him on his being ousted from the Godolphin Ministry, was Secretary of State. The conduct of affairs thus came into the hands of two men—the one with the head of a pedant and the soul of a chambermaid, the other with a brilliant genius, a handsome person, fascinating manners, a snake's tongue, and a devil's heart—who were able, in the short space of four years, to inflict deeper wounds on the honour of Great Britain than has ever been possible for any other ministers since the Revolution. Dr. Burton seems to consider that the collection of the Harleian manuscripts and the Harleian pamphlets gives Harley a claim on our esteem. We accept and value these gifts, but we should sink ourselves to the level of some of his contemporaries were we on that account to veil our contempt for the giver. Of St. John—Viscount Bolingbroke, as he presently became—a renegade alike to his party, his country, and his God, it is difficult to find words to express our loathing and detestation. If he had had convictions, no matter how false we esteemed them, we might have condoned some of his offences; but it is impossible for anyone who gives even a slight examination to the story of his career, to form any opinion but that his only political creed was his personal advancement, his only moral creed was his personal gratification.

The new Ministry had come in as the representatives of the peace party, and on that account, as well as for their own personal aims, it was incumbent on them to take measures to end the war as soon as possible. Secret negotiations were therefore entered on early in January 1711, and were continued for months without any of the Allies being cognisant of the fact. But here again we find Dr. Burton greatly at fault in dealing with some of the most curious diplomatic transactions in our history. The Dutch, who in the conferences at the Hague two years before, had honestly refused to entertain any proposals made to them alone, were assured over and over again that England would not treat separately, but at this very time these secret and independent negotiations were going on, without any regard to the interests of either Holland or the Empire. Meantime, during the summer of 1711, the war dragged along without profit, but not without cost. On the change of the Ministry, Marlborough had been personally requested by the Queen to retain the command of the army; and he had consented to do so, on the understanding that the Duchess was to retain her appointments at Court. To this Harley was disposed to agree. He wished to follow a con-

ciliatory policy. To his timidity and cunning it seemed prudent to stand well with both parties; and Marlborough, if pushed too far, might be a dangerous enemy. But St. John, with a keen sense of former benefits, was determined to break down the Marlborough interest, and in this he had an eager and capable assistant in Lady Masham. In January the Duchess was abruptly dismissed from her offices, and the Duke, deeply hurt, resolved to throw up the command. He yielded, however, to the persuasions of the Pensionary Heinsius, of Eugene, his colleague through so many years and in so many glorious actions, of Godolphin, and of numerous other friends at home and abroad. He again took the field; but his forces being weakened by the withdrawal of some 5,000 English troops, and the recall of Eugene with the Austrians on the death of the Emperor, nothing was done except the capture of Bouchain, which thus, as Bolingbroke was pleased to remark, cost the country some 7,000,000*l*.

It is useless to enquire whether more might have been done if Marlborough had been honestly supported by the Government. In point of fact, he was not. Lady Masham was anxious to push her brother, Brigadier Hill, on to distinction; and this Brigadier Hill's very moderate abilities rendered difficult. She had already obtained for him rapid promotion from the Queen, in defiance of Marlborough's objections; she was now anxious to obtain for him an independent command. For this purpose an expedition was sent against Quebec. When she proposed the scheme to Harley, he refused to have anything to do with it; she had recourse to St. John, who eagerly seized the opportunity of ousting his colleague and ingratiating himself with the favourite. Between the two the expedition was planned. The ships, the officers were chosen; Rear-Admiral Sir Hovenden Walker appointed to the command; his instructions given to him on April 11, 1711; and all 'without so much as consulting the then Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, either as to the fitness of the ships appointed for the expedition, or the nature of the navigation.' So says Burchett; and further, that, on the contrary, the design on which the ships were bound was industriously hid from them; and that it appears from some letters to Sir Hovenden Walker that

'a certain person seemed to value himself very much that a design of this nature was kept a secret from the Admiralty, who, had they been consulted, would not, I am apt to think, have advised the sending ships of eighty and seventy guns to Quebec, since the navigation up the River St. Lawrence was generally esteemed to be very dangerous.'

And that storehouse of iniquity, the Bolingbroke Correspondence, shows us that this 'certain person' was St. John. Dr. Burton has told us how 'at Boston, the expedition was afflicted 'by one of many blunders;' that 'provisions were not obtainable, as no notice had been given of the needs that had to be 'supplied;' but he does not say that, by this blunder, the expedition was detained for six weeks, or that the 80-gun ships were found to be too big, and had to be left behind. He has attributed the failure altogether to the calms, gales, and fogs, which baffled the navigation, not in any degree to the ignorance with which the expedition was planned, or the delay which the neglect to send timely orders to Boston had entailed; and he draws the inference that although the failure 'is often 'cited as the result of appointing to a position of heavy responsibility one having influence at Court, instead of a man 'whose qualifications have been tested,' as the case really stood, 'Jack Hill had no opportunity either of ruining the 'expedition or promoting its object.' But the details of the expedition were certainly not planned by St. John and Lady Masham. We know in fact that they were, to a great extent, suggested by a Colonel Nicholson, who had commanded the land forces engaged at the capture of Nova Scotia the year before; nor can we doubt that Hill was called into council in framing the instructions, and so far had the opportunity of at least assisting in the ruin of the expedition.

And this was the one undertaking of the war for which the new Ministry was distinctly responsible. For the rest, Marlborough was so hampered that nothing was done. He was naturally annoyed; we may believe that, independent of personal reasons, he was indignant at the shameful neglect of the public interests. The preliminaries of peace, privately agreed on between St. John and De Torcy, had been hastily signed as soon as the former received the news of the Quebec failure. These had been obtained by the Emperor's ambassador, Count Gallas, who, in the hopes of frustrating them, had them published. They were such as the war party did not, such as no one who held the honour of England as the first article of his political creed could, approve of; and when, on December 7, the Queen, in opening Parliament, announced that 'notwithstanding the arts of those who delight in war, both place and time are appointed for opening the treaty of a general peace,' the Earl of Nottingham moved, as an amendment to the address, to insert a clause to the effect 'that no peace could be safe or honourable to Great Britain or Europe if Spain and the West Indies were to be allotted to any branch

‘ of the House of Bourbon.’ In the debate on this resolution, Marlborough took occasion to say that ‘ he could by no means ‘ give in to the measures that had lately been taken to enter into ‘ a negotiation of peace with France ; ’ and that he was of opinion that ‘ the safety and liberties of Europe would be in imminent ‘ danger, if Spain and the West Indies were left to the House ‘ of Bourbon.’ Finally, the amendment was carried by a majority of 61 against 55. This defeat filled the Government with terror and alarm. It was for some days a question whether they could remain in office; whether they might not be impeached. If so, their secret and traitorous dealings with the Court of France and the Pretender would necessarily be divulged. The lives of the traitors trembled in the balance. Harley, now the Earl of Oxford, a coward as well as a knave, was paralysed; but St. John, amongst whose many splendid natural gifts was numbered undaunted courage, rose above the danger. By a stretch of the royal prerogative, such as has never since been equalled, he swamped the hostile majority in the Lords by the creation of a dozen new peers: ‘ if these are ‘ not enough,’ he said, ‘ we’ll make a dozen more.’ But they were enough, and the House accepted the Queen’s unfavourable answer to the address.

The alarm which the Ministers had suffered, determined them to break the power of the Opposition. Of this Marlborough was the undoubted head. The amendment to the address was believed to be entirely his work; he had spoken on it, strongly against the Government. It was said that, out of his enormous wealth, he had made it worth the while of some of the poorer or more greedy lords to vote against the Government. Now that they, in turn, had a majority, they would crush him; they would deprive him of all his offices; if possible, they would disgrace him. An examination into the accounts of the army showed that Marlborough had regularly received from the contractors large sums, which, it was alleged, were of the nature of extortion. He explained that these sums of money, paid by the contractors, were, and always had been, the recognised perquisites of the Commander-in-Chief, and that they were in fact secret service money. The explanation was not accepted, and the report was laid before the House of Commons; whereupon the Queen, in order that the affair might be considered without prejudice, dismissed him from all his employments. There was some talk of impeaching him. But the object of the Government had been attained; and any further process would be certainly troublesome, and possibly dangerous. The accusations died

away as soon as they had served their immediate purpose. That, both at home and on the continent, Marlborough had dispensed large sums for secret service, there can be little doubt. In an age when venality was the rule, he would not have had the success he so uniformly had, if he had clung to his money with the miserly grasp that has been so often described. But that, in these matters alleged against him, his hands were clean, according to our present standard, it would be impossible to maintain. That, according to the standard of his own age, no one thought any the worse of him, is sufficiently evident by the course of his life for the ten following years, and the national mourning at his death.

But with the fall of Marlborough in 1712, the Government was, for the time, secure. And so, between useless war and disgraceful peace, the year dragged along. The false and crooked policy of St. John—created Viscount Bolingbroke in July—has often been described. During a long life he professed himself, in turn, as belonging to every party, and every section of every party, which agitated the government of England, Whigs, Tories, or Jacobites; he was Secretary of State for the Queen of England, under two governments; and in France he was Secretary of State for the Pretender. But by every party to which he joined himself, by every government of which he was a member, he was known and hated as a traitor, even whilst the fascination of his manners made him tolerated, and the splendour of his genius made him admired. But of the many infamous actions which disgraced his life, the negotiations which prefaced the peace of Utrecht were the most infamous. It is not that we doubt the advantage of peace to England. As an abstract rule, peace is always better than war; and at that time the country was, in a measure, exhausted by a war which had lasted, with little intermission, for five-and-twenty years. It is not even that we doubt the necessity of acquiescing in the Bourbon rule in Spain. That was an established fact, which the course of events in Spain had confirmed, which the altered conditions of the Empire rendered almost advisable. But as to the details of the treaty there can be little difference of opinion; as to the manner in which the peace was concluded there ought to be none. It is here that we are most distinctly at variance with Dr. Burton. His account of these negotiations is very short, but it gives us the idea of his having examined them in a very cursory manner; it is, in fact, little more than a statement of the case as it was represented by the ministerial majority in the House of Commons. Dr. Burton has overlooked

this, and has described the arguments put forward as those of the country at large. We think too he is quite wrong in attributing the desire for peace to any dread of Dutch ascendancy, or to any recollection of the old wars against Tromp or De Ruyter. There had been nothing in those wars to inspire dread; and the bitter memories had been drowned at Barfleur or Malaga, had been buried at Blenheim or Malplaquet. It has been, at all times, the nature of the English people to be suspicious of the foreigner; and the Dutch had been and were the most dangerous commercial rivals. It may be admitted that a jealousy of the Dutch might easily have been awakened; but we do not believe that such a feeling had anything to do with urging on the peace of Utrecht. We do not believe that the sense of the country had any idea of what was being done. The negotiations were entirely the work of Oxford and Bolingbroke, who must share the infamy of them; but the credit due to the ability which carried them through is Bolingbroke's alone. Since the question of these negotiations was discussed, from original materials, in this *Journal* forty-five years ago,* no evidence has been published to lead us to alter the conclusions then arrived at, or to doubt that a desire to strengthen the interest of the Pretender—of course for their personal ends—was the motive which guided both Oxford and Bolingbroke in forcing a treaty so favourable to France through the obstacles of negotiation. But this treaty, out of whose most boasted clauses sprang the Spanish wars of 1718, of 1726, and of 1739, moulded the course of events even to our own time, and we cannot accept as a history of the time of Queen Anne a work which passes so lightly over the intrigues, conferences, and negotiations at the Hague, Gertruydenberg, and Utrecht, and disposes of the whole matter in some half-dozen pages.

On this very important point, then, we think that Dr. Burton has altogether fallen short of the promise conveyed by his title-page. And not only in this, but in the history of the intrigues which, after the peace of Utrecht, went near to bring about the restoration of the banished line of kings. That, in any case, such a restoration could have been permanent, we do not believe; but the attempt, had it been made, must have launched the country into civil war, and have caused much bloodshed before it could be overcome. That Dr. Burton has passed over this terrible possibility unnoticed; that he has, in a few lines, disposed of the events immediately preceding the Queen's death, the events of that memorable day, big with the

* *Edinburgh Review*, vol. lxii. pp. 12 *et seq.*

fate of the country, when, as Lord Macaulay has eloquently described it, the Duke of Shrewsbury, after many inactive and inglorious years, again stood forth the Shrewsbury of 1688; that he has not referred to the schemes of Bolingbroke, or the hopes of the whole Jacobite party, might well excite our wonder, were it not that other omissions and shortcomings towards the end of the book lead us to believe either that he was weary of the task he had undertaken, or has been, in some way, prevented from finishing it.

Of these shortcomings the most remarkable is the last chapter of all. When we remember the position which the age of Anne really holds in English literature—the age, not to mention lesser lights, of Addison and Swift and Defoe, in poetry of Pope, in science of Newton—and read what Dr. Burton has now to say on the history of ‘Intellectual Progress,’ we stand aghast, and can only conjecture that we have here, not the serious work of one who for the last thirty years has adorned the foremost rank of scholars and historians, but rather the rough gleanings of his commonplace book. Other imperfections we have already noticed—inaccuracies, inelegancies, which give each its own proof of weariness or preoccupation. But History is a jealous muse, and will not be so worshipped. The result in this case is a book which, with many able and suggestive chapters, is, as a whole, not one which will raise Dr. Burton’s reputation, or satisfy the cravings of those who can conceive a history of the reign of Queen Anne as embodying the type of all that is grand and picturesque and dramatic in the annals of England. Such a history has still to be written: to write it may be the happy fortune of some one yet unborn to fame.

ART. IX.—*Return of Members elected to serve in the Commons House of Parliament, April 1880.*

THE old Parliament is no more. The new Parliament has taken its place. Not ‘glad tidings of great joy’ to politicians who quote Scripture for their own purposes, but glad tidings indeed to all in this country who dreaded the gradual but determined advance of Imperialist democracy, and to all in foreign lands who had been used to look to a British Parliament for support in struggles for liberty, for sympathy in the season of failure, and for hearty congratulation on the arrival of success. Not many tears will be shed over the departed. Born ‘in th’ eclipse’—happily, such eclipses are but

temporary—of good sense and forethought, at all events on one side of the political sphere, indebted for its distinguishing characteristics to an unseemly alliance between the authorised exponents of divine truth and the licensed retailers of spirituous liquors, it has run its course under the guidance of a leader more remarkable for craft than for strength of statesmanship, with a front bench made up of respectable mediocrities and disorderly schoolboys, but with a majority behind who atoned for any little deficiency which existed in capacity for debate or ability to govern by the solidity of their prejudices and the healthiness of their lungs.

By the electoral decisions of the past few weeks all this has been changed. Many familiar faces have disappeared from Westminster. The Chairman of Committees himself is no longer member for Chester, and Mr. Raikes will probably subside into a permanent office in the Civil Service. Members of the late Government have not been spared—Mr. Salt, of the Local Government Board; Mr. Egerton, of the Admiralty; Lord Yarmouth, Comptroller of the Household; Sir Graham Montgomery, a Lord of the Treasury; Mr. James Lowther, Chief Secretary for Ireland. The rejection of the Chief Secretary for Ireland by the electors of York was a remarkable fact. He had sat for that city for fifteen years, he had been an official whenever there was an opportunity, and after filling various subordinate posts he had become Chief Secretary for Ireland. Perhaps no appointment was ever more inappropriate, for this gentleman was singularly ill-qualified to deal with the peculiarities—may we say the weaknesses?—of the Irish character.

The officials have not been the only or the principal victims. There is, and always has been, a peculiar people among the Liberals who signalise themselves by voting in the wrong lobby on crucial divisions. A great orator once satirised them as dwellers in the Cave of Adullam, and although the original occupants of that dwelling have most of them passed away, there is no Parliament which does not contribute some fresh candidates for the vacant tenement. Mr. Samuda, Mr. Ripley, Mr. Yeaman—their place knows them no more, and several other gentlemen whom we refrain from mentioning by name only escaped, by an abrupt change of residence, the fate which has overtaken their fellow-lodgers.

In the last Parliament there was a set of men who devoted themselves to the congenial task of attacking the person to whom, more than to any other one man, the Liberal party owes its present position—the person who, with more discretion

than Peter the Hermit, but with as much eloquence and enthusiasm, has preached in Scotland a more successful crusade than did his eleventh-century predecessor. Some of these assailants barked safely at a distance; others approached nearer, only to experience the *impar congressus Achilli*. Of these the greater part is gone, and those who remain are hardly likely, missing the cheers of nearly half their old associates, to renew the onslaught.

It is to be noticed in this election that the beer interest has been anything but successful. Out of some twenty brewers who sat in the last Parliament nearly half have lost their seats, nor are we aware that their places have been filled by more than one or two fresh members of the fraternity. But if beer has waned, books and newspapers have been eminently popular. The sneer of some carping critic who proposed to reapply to the last Parliament the sobriquet of 'Parliamentum 'indoctum' will be very inapplicable to this, when we remember that, in addition to seven journalists who adorned the last House of Commons, seven others will appear in the present, no less than four of whom are connected with one London newspaper of Liberal fame. The entrance of so large a number of journalists to the House of Commons is a striking proof of the growing influence of the press, which is one of the most important training-schools of modern politicians. These are men of literary ability, who have at least made a study of the science of politics, who have sat in the gallery and followed closely the course of events. Under the veil of anonymous writing they have tried their strength and trained their powers, and it is not improbable that some of them will display equal ability in public debate, and eventually in official life. In Ireland especially, many of the late members, belonging to the country gentry, whether Liberal or Tory, Catholic or Protestant, have been displaced by contributors to the public journals, the Irish having an especial aptitude, both here and in America, for that species of literary polemics.

The great houses, on one side of politics at least, have been signal sufferers. In the last Parliament there were three Hamiltons of the Abercorn family. In this there is only one out of four who offered themselves to be elected. In the last Parliament there were, when the Parliament assembled, two Herveys of the Bristol family; now there are none. In the last Parliament there were two Scotts of Buccleuch; now there is only one. In the last Parliament two Lowthers, now one; two Stanhopes, now one; two Wynns, now one. The heir of the Duke of Manchester is out, so is the heir of the

Marquis of Hertford, so is the heir of Lord Penrhyn, so is the heir of Lord Dunsany, so is the brother of Lord Waterford, so is the heir of the Harewoods, so is the heir presumptive of the Duke of Wellington; only one Gathorne Hardy; Lord Muncaster out for West Cumberland, and so goes on the list of failures.

A remarkable defeat is that of Mr. Clare Sewell Read in South Norfolk. It is true it was by but one vote, but at the last election he was 447 votes ahead of Mr. Gurdon, who now takes his place. Mr. Read's course in Parliament is an example of the difficulty which even the most practised sportsman finds in running with the hare and hunting with the hounds. He entered the House specifically as the farmers' advocate. He was their salaried agent. His great knowledge and shrewd sense made him a power in Parliament, and when the Tories came into office he became Secretary of the Local Government Board. Greatly to his credit, he resigned office when he found he could no longer consistently hold it. Still, he has incurred the displeasure of his supporters, owing, no doubt, to the hostile attitude to the Farmers' Alliance which he assumed at their Norwich meeting two months ago, and he reaps the consequences. But we think his supporters were ungrateful, and we regret the exclusion of so honest a man.

The results, negative and positive, of the general election show that the farmers are wavering in their allegiance to the squires. They are beginning at last to find out that the creditor and the debtor have opposite interests, and that a disguised landlord's agent is not the best possible tenant's champion. Accordingly Mr. Pell, who headed the poll in 1874, now figures in the second place; a tenant farmer's Liberal candidate is returned for Herefordshire, and another narrowly escapes representing East Suffolk. Mr. Howard, M.P. for Bedfordshire; Mr. Barclay, M.P. for Forfarshire; Mr. Duckham, M.P. for Herefordshire; Mr. Laycock, M.P. for North Lincolnshire, are all members of the Farmers' Alliance.

Questions relating to agriculture and the tenure of land cannot fail to assume a prominent importance in the new Parliament, and we therefore learn with the greatest satisfaction that they will be discussed, not by a House of landed proprietors only, but by representative tenant farmers, who have the most complete practical acquaintance with the subject. Not, indeed, that we believe, or admit, that the interests of landlords and tenants are at variance; we believe them, on the contrary, to be inseparable and identical. The possession of land, without

men qualified and willing to work it, is a mere encumbrance; and the problem is to adjust the conditions on which it is to be held and worked on the most equitable terms to both parties. In their attempt to deal with this great subject, Lord Beaconsfield's Government have been singularly unsuccessful. That noble earl has not even fulfilled the expectations he had from time to time held out in his rural orations to the Aylesbury Farmers' Club; and the fate of British agriculture has been consigned to the obscure labours of a Royal Commission. What could be more absurd and unpractical than the Agricultural Holdings Act, repudiated as it has been by all the great landowners and landowning corporations in the country? What more unsatisfactory than their attempts at recognising the rights of ratepayers in their Bills for the establishment of County Boards? Have they ever tried to deal with the law of distress in England, or with the game law? The fact is, to take the Duke of Argyll's somewhat unceremonious expression, and apply it to the whole Tory party, 'they have been found out,' and they are reaping the consequences among the farmers, once their staunchest adherents.

The verdict of certain important counties is worthy of note. Durham, which, out of thirteen seats, even in the last Parliament had filled twelve with Liberals, has now completed the tale by adding a thirteenth in the place of the renowned Sir George Elliot. Yorkshire in the last Parliament returned twenty-one Liberals and eighteen Tories. This time it has returned thirty-two Liberals and only seven Tories, all three divisions of the West Riding being represented by Liberals. But Lancashire, the county which boasts of thinking to-day what England will think to-morrow, has in a most remarkable way signalised her change of front. In 1874 every member for the four divisions of the county was a Tory, and out of the twenty-five boroughs seventeen were represented by Tories, and only eight by Liberals. Now of the four divisions of the county two are represented by Liberals, and of the twenty-five boroughs seventeen are represented by Liberals, and only eight by Tories. So that in place of the twenty-one Tories out of twenty-nine members sent by Lancashire to the Parliament of 1874, twenty-one Liberals will be members of the present House, exactly reversing the numbers of the two political parties.

But if the verdict of great counties is important, still more important is the verdict of the principality of Wales and of the kingdom of Scotland. Out of the fifteen Welsh county members in the last Parliament, seven were Liberal and eight

Tory, now thirteen are Liberal and only two Tory. From the boroughs the solitary Tory member of the Parliament of 1874 has disappeared, and the representation of Wales, thirty in number, consists of twenty-eight Liberals and two Tories.

Scotland is just as remarkable. In 1874 Scotland returned sixteen Liberal county members against sixteen Tories. In 1880 she returns twenty-six Liberals against six Tories. In 1874 she returned twenty-four Liberals and four Tories, borough and University members; in 1880, twenty-seven Liberals and one Tory. The total of Scotland being in 1874 forty Liberals to twenty Tories; in 1880 fifty-three Liberals to seven Tories. So that it has been jocularly observed that one first-class compartment of a railway carriage will supply places for all the Conservative members from Scotland; and, shortly to sum up the facts of the case, the comparison stands as follows:—

PARLIAMENT OF 1874.

	Liberal	Tory
English County Members	27	145
English University and Borough Members .	145	140
Welsh County Members	7	8
Welsh Borough Members	14	1
Scotch County Members	16	16
Scotch University and Borough Members .	24	4
Irish County Members	43	21
Irish University and Borough Members .	26	13
	302	348

PARLIAMENT OF 1880.

	Liberal	Tory
English County Members	54	118
English University and Borough Members .	200	85
Welsh County Members	13	2
Welsh Borough Members	15	—
Scotch County Members	26	6
Scotch University and Borough Members .	27	1
Irish County Members	53	11
Irish University and Borough Members .	23	16
	411	239

So that, counting the Home Rulers as Liberals, as they have been counted in the preceding lists, the Liberals now number 411, and the Tories 239, as against 302 and 348

in the last Parliament. Or, taking the Home Rulers as a body of separate politicians, there are 351 Liberals, 60 Home Rulers, and 239 Tories in the present House of Commons.

It is a not uninteresting enquiry just at present to note the differences which exist between the Parliament which has just been elected and that which preceded it. But a consideration remains for us far transcending in interest such local and personal investigations—the consideration that from the aggregate of these personal and political changes springs a result unrivalled in importance, the retirement of the Beaconsfield Administration.

The skilful plagiarist who presided over that body has popularised an old sentiment, in words which many people think to be his own, by saying that the unexpected always happens. To the multitude this was emphatically the case in the event to which we have referred. Two months ago, all the London daily papers, with a very few honourable and well-known exceptions, were fighting the battles and proclaiming the praises of the Beaconsfield Administration. ‘O King, live for ever!’ was the chorus which resounded on every side. But during the last four weeks a most remarkable change of tone has taken place. The arch-weathercock, after ‘fronting south ‘by north’ for several days, has now decided that after all there is very little difference between the foreign policy of Lord Beaconsfield and the foreign policy of Lord Hartington, and avows that ‘we have been living on poor diet in the way ‘of domestic legislation for some time past, and the more ‘promptly some substantial food can be set before us the ‘better;’ while the ‘mean prints,’ after six years of persistent calumny and abuse lavished on those whom they had once effusively and fawningly supported, are beginning for once to be civil and acknowledge at last that if there is to be a Liberal majority, the stronger the better. Society too, by which we mean the mass of ignorance, laziness, and prejudice, male loungers and female gossips, which usurps the name—those who two years ago were never satisfied without ‘jumping upon’ the opinions and convictions of sober people who knew something about politics—society is beginning to find out its mistake, and as its uncles and its cousins are summarily dealt with in the counties and boroughs of the Empire, and the nice little family cliques are broken up by the agency of the ballot-box, it goes about in sackcloth and ashes, and begins to believe that the sun will never shine, and sugar will never be sweet again in the mouth, for those who have to submit to a Liberal majority.

Amidst all the discouragements and indignities to which those who hold Liberal opinions have been subject during the last four years, there is one thing for which they have cause to be abundantly grateful, and that is the staunch and consistent conduct of the country Liberal press. To the great Liberal newspapers, the 'Scotsman,' the 'Manchester Guardian,' the 'Leeds Mercury,' and many others, the party at large owes a deep debt of gratitude. They were not intimidated. They were not deceived. They kept the light of political truth burning brightly while it was obscured or extinguished in the metropolis. They never lost hope of a reaction, and they did much, very much, to create and foster it.

The reaction has not come a moment too soon. With the highest respect for the personal virtues of many who formed part of the late Parliament, we feel bound to insist that it was ignorant, reactionary, and tyrannical. It included among its members an unusual number of new men, men who knew nothing of Parliamentary traditions, men whose chief claim to a seat was their wealth, men whose aim was to rise in the social scale, and who thought, as so many of the *nouveaux riches* do think, that Toryism was a step to fashion. Such men can never become satisfactory politicians. Their opinions are merely assumed or adopted for purposes of social aggrandisement, and they consequently become the willing tools of any Minister who requires their services. And when, as appears to have been lately the case, the Minister they followed was himself only playing a part, although playing that part with consummate skill, the evil is doubled. With such a combination we are never secure from the most disastrous political surprises.

Whatever lowers the tone and impairs the character of official life is a great calamity, but a calamity which may be retrieved by a change in the persons who are at the head of affairs. Mesmerised by bad example, we may have a great noble asserting overnight that a certain document which appeared in the evening papers was 'wholly unauthentic' and 'not deserving of confidence,' while it appeared the next morning that if not virtually correct it contained an accurate report of the substance of the Salisbury-Schouvaloff agreement. We may have an amiable and conscientious country gentleman assuring the House of Commons, in proposing an unusually long Easter adjournment, that he did so 'with no concealed designs or any intentions of a mischievous character,' when the very next day there appeared in the evening papers a Reuter's telegram, which stated that the Indian

Government had received orders to despatch an army of Sepoys to Malta.. But when the great noble and the amiable country gentleman have given place to more straightforward successors, it may be hoped that the views of morality entertained by the clerks at the Foreign Office and the Treasury may recover the strain under which they have suffered without permanent damage.

With Parliament it is not so. Any lowering of the character of that assembly is a permanent national disaster, and the evidence is strong that one of the objects which the late Prime Minister has held steadily in view—even from the days when, with Semitic prevision, he sketched his own future principles of action in the pages of a novel—has been to substitute personal for Parliamentary government, and thereby lower the character and weaken the influence of the very instrument by the use of which he rose to power. Nor has he been without assistance in Parliament itself. Even the newspapers ceased to report at length these monotonous debates. That system of obstruction—with which Lord Beaconsfield played so long, and against which he never exerted any serious influence until he saw it was hopeless to attempt to identify it with any action of the Liberal party—helped his game, and enabled him to sap the faith of many weak-kneed politicians who were inclined to think small things of Parliamentary government. All this is now over, and it is to be hoped that the ‘men of light and leading’ who will guide the counsels of the new Parliament will deal boldly and strongly with conduct which tends to degrade, discredit, and disable the action of the greatest representative body which ever sat.

It is well not to scrutinise too closely the excuses which a beaten party are sure to invent to account for their defeat. If those excuses are mere phrases, like the ‘strategical movements’ of our American cousins, they hardly deserve attention. We are, however, now informed that the Liberal victory has been due to a flood of corrupt expenditure lavished from the inexhaustible resources of the leaders of the party. In fact, the names of the contributors have been published in some Tory prints. We happen to have the means of knowing some of the facts, and we are glad to be able to inform our political opponents that of the whole list only one person has contributed anything towards a fund of the kind, and that in this case the contribution was of a much more moderate amount than the sum specified. Unfortunately for the Liberal party, it is not on their side that the inexhaustible resources exist; and the difficulty always is, not how to spend boundless supplies of

wealth in corrupt extravagance, but how to husband very moderate contributions for the legitimate purpose of elections.

There is another source of consolation to which our opponents have recourse, which we beg to assure them is equally groundless. It is asserted that a vast majority of the new Liberal members are men of extreme opinions, and that it will be impossible for the more moderate men of the party to avoid being dragged along, by the mere force of numbers, to the adoption of measures from which they would naturally shrink. As it happens, the reverse is the case. Those men who would by their opinions be induced to sit *above* the gangway, very far outnumber those who would sit *below*. There is no doubt that in the formation of a Ministry the claims and wishes of all sections of the party will require consideration, but no one can have watched the career of public men to any purpose who has not seen the sobering effect of official responsibility. Mr. Fawcett and Sir Charles Dilke undoubtedly go further in their Liberalism than Lord Hartington and Lord Granville; but we have every confidence that men so capable as they are will see the necessity of subordinating theory to practice, and prefer, in the interest of our common country, moderate, even if they think them somewhat inadequate reforms, to more extensive and unlimited alterations. We have no reason to doubt that the leading principles of the new Government and of the Liberal party, of which it is the head, will be based on those 'plain Whig principles' which we endeavoured to define in our last number. The Liberal party owes its success, in no small degree, to the repudiation of those extreme and, as we think, extravagant designs which were falsely imputed to it by its antagonists. The attempt to drive the country into the arms of the Tories by a pretended fear of Home Rule, Disestablishment, and the Disintegration of the Empire, utterly failed. Those topics were only named at the elections to be renounced by the great majority of Liberal candidates; and we see no reason to apprehend that they will now be revived.

Our Tory friends are very fond of enlarging on Liberal differences. There is a certain staleness in a sentiment which has been uttered thousands of times in unnumbered varieties of forms, but we must hazard it once more; and it is, that a Liberal party without differences of opinion among its constituent parts would be a tideless sea, a sunless sky, a landscape without features, a piece of music without intervals, or anything which can best express what is effete and monotonous. It is the interchange and free expression of varying views

which give to the Liberal party half its life and all its usefulness. It is all very well for people who for a quarter of a century have placed their political destinies in the hands of a man who, so far as can be seen, is merely counsel for the plaintiff, and who, if circumstances had been different, might just as well have been counsel for the defendant, to complain that we on the Liberal side do not cut all our coats to the same pattern, but indulge in varieties, it may sometimes happen in extravagances, of costume. This, however, is at all events certain, that if we are not so harmonious and so easily led as our opponents, it is simply because free opinion is more likely to exhibit divergences than blind traditionary prejudice, and because docility in politics is not always the distinguishing mark of wisdom.

‘Nothing succeeds like success.’ The holy horror with which our Tory friends surveyed the surprising spectacle of a man of seventy casting himself unasked into the midst of a vast political conflict, attacking here, parrying there, succeeding everywhere, raising the *perfervidum ingenium Scotorum* to a white heat of enthusiasm, and producing, or doing very much to produce, not in Scotland only but in Wales and in England, the astonishing and unlooked-for results of the general election, was not altogether confined to one side in politics. We ourselves confess to having looked with considerable doubt upon the effect of the crusade, and we still feel that political revolutions are not always best effected by appeals to the passionate and the enthusiastic side of men’s natures. But it is as little possible to deny the success of the appeal as it would be to doubt the sincerity or question the eloquence of the advocate.*

* In our reference to one of the causes of the great Liberal triumph, it would not be just to omit all reference to another, though a less public one—we mean the establishment of a central office for furthering the political objects of the party. Until 1874 such an office did not exist. At present, under the able management of Mr. Adam and other prominent members of the party, it has become so efficient that candidates were provided for every borough held by Tories, with the exception of *five*, before the late dissolution was announced, and that of these boroughs all but two were fought. In the counties, too, working associations connected with the central body were employed almost in every instance where there was a hope of success, thus enabling the country to reap the full benefit of the change of feeling when the reaction set in. Mr. Adam, who is not more shrewd than he is modest, has been the leading spirit in all this useful work; and it is only right that the party should know, what he would be the last man to tell them, to whom it is that they are principally indebted for this most useful organisation.

From this state of circumstances another result arises. After the general election of 1874 it was usually believed that the official career of the Prime Minister, who then resigned his post, was concluded, and that in any fresh political combinations the Liberal party would not have to reckon upon more than his unofficial support. Now, however, the case is different. It is possible that Mr. Gladstone may have been persuaded to reconsider his decision, and in any case it is obvious that he must share to a considerable extent in the responsible formation of the new Government. But whatever be the position allotted to Mr. Gladstone, or assumed by him, in this Government, he will return to office, not with the grudging acquiescence, but with the full and enthusiastic assent, of the whole Liberal party. It is impossible, at the moment at which these sheets will leave the press (although we have already delayed our usual publication for some days to ascertain the clear result of the elections), for us to hazard any surmises as to the composition of the future Government; and we abstain from mere conjecture. But we are confident that whatever the arrangements of the new Ministry may be, and by whomsoever they may be made, they will comprise in the first instance a large proportion of men already tried and well known in public life—men of moderate opinions, experience, and judgment both in domestic, foreign, colonial, and Indian affairs. It will not be a, flighty or experimental Government, nor will its elements be so weak as to receive their sole impress and direction from the will of one man, as has been the case in the Tory Government. Nothing can be more unfortunate to any Government than the uncontrolled ascendancy of any statesman, however eminent. Twelve or fifteen Ministers meet in Council to deliberate and decide, not to obey; and we do not hesitate to say that some considerable latitude and diversity of opinion is not only admissible but desirable in the Cabinet, in order that questions may be discussed from a wider range of the political horizon. We doubt not, therefore, that the Cabinet will also contain a certain number of members belonging to the younger and more advanced school of political life, and we shall hail with great satisfaction their entry upon duties which involve strict ministerial responsibility, and compel them to weigh both their words and their actions.

There is a remarkable difference in the facilities of what is called 'Cabinet-making,' as regards the two great political groups. When a Tory Government has to be formed, the difficulty is whom to put in. When a Liberal Government comes into being, the embarrassment is whom to leave

out. In the late Cabinet, for example, it is evident that, after the retirement of Lord Derby and Lord Carnarvon, the governing spirits might have been accommodated in a *coupé*, and that the Leader of the House of Commons would not have been one of the passengers. In fact, it was, with these exceptions, a Cabinet of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions and official clerks, whose pitiable want of debating power was only atoned for by the strength of their following, but who, as a minority, would have been absolutely effaced by the front bench of the Opposition. In fact, if the members of the late Administration who belong to the House of Peers were withdrawn from it, Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Cairns, Lord Salisbury, and Lord Cranbrook, the Cabinet would have been reduced to a mere residuum hardly able to boast of a single man, holding the rank of a statesman or an orator, in its composition. We shall have an opportunity of judging of their real strength in debate, when they are arrayed against the serried phalanx of her Majesty's Government, and we question whether at any time the Parliamentary resources of the Tory party were so low. They have had Sir Robert Peel, they have had Mr. Disraeli, to lead them when in Opposition. They must now rely on Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord George Hamilton, and Mr. Cross. With the Liberal party the case is different, and, were it not for the spirit of generous self-effacement which characterises so many public men, the difficulties of choice would be insuperable. Let us hope, however, that these difficulties will be surmounted, and that no personal soreness or feelings of disappointment may in any wise damp the loyalty of any member of the party.

The ensuing session cannot be a long one. If Parliament meets at the end of the present month, it will only do so to elect a Speaker, to swear in members, and then to adjourn for a period of at least a fortnight, to enable the new Ministry to return to their constituents. This brings us to the middle of May, and only leaves about ten or eleven weeks before the time when the centrifugal forces of the autumn begin to develop themselves. It is evident, therefore, that no measures involving long debate can be discussed, still less passed, this year. Mr. Osborne Morgan's Bill, which, no doubt, will become in fact, if not in name, a Government measure, will probably occupy the attention of the new House at an early date. The Ballot Act will require renewal, and perhaps amendment, and it is not improbable that an amendment in the Corrupt Practices Act, which was passed in the last days of the moribund Parliament, and which is supposed to have

added sensibly to the expense of all contested borough elections, may be re-discussed and possibly repealed.

Financial questions will at once require the attention of the new House, for it is obvious that Sir Stafford Northcote's Budget, born before its time, was a very incomplete provision for the exigencies of the public service. It is probable that the outgoing Ministers will have left to their successors something very much in the nature of a *damnosa hæreditas*. But the bill will have to be made out, and provision made for its payment, although it is not unlikely that it will be much larger than has been predicted. We all remember the precedent of the Abyssinian expedition.

All questions, however, like the reform of the real property laws, the establishment of local financial boards, and the equalisation of the county franchise, will, as it appears to us, be necessarily postponed to future sessions. The first of these measures might with propriety be introduced in the House of Lords, and it would be well if the judicial experience of both sides of their Lordships' House could be united in the discussion. Both sides are agreed that the matter requires grave consideration, and that reforms in the spirit of the bill introduced by Lord Cairns are advisable; and it may perhaps be hoped that, in an atmosphere which is beyond the cyclonic influence of contested elections, a question which concerns the whole country might be discussed with learning and without party heat.

Measures of Parliamentary reform are best discussed towards the conclusion of a Parliament. In fact, if passed, they almost involve the necessity of a Parliamentary dissolution. The future Government may therefore see their way to postponing discussions of this nature for some time, but when the proper period arrives the question will have to be discussed, and it is most important that it should be done with calmness and wisdom. It is not so simple as at first sight appears. It involves a fresh modification of the borough franchise on the one hand, or the abolition of one of the chief elements, as well as the introduction of a most important new feature into the franchise of the counties. If the county franchise is merely lowered to the household qualification, we shall have freeholders, copyholders, *and* leaseholders voting in the counties, and only leasehold occupiers voting in the boroughs. Thus we shall be as far off as ever from securing identity of franchise. The only method, as it appears to us, by which this identity can be secured is by the limitation of the county franchise to occupiers, as in the boroughs it is now limited. This will secure not

merely that theoretic harmony which is dear to the speculative politician, but the practical abolition of a great scandal and evil, the faggot vote. It will diminish but to a very small extent the legitimate influence of property, and it will vastly lessen the expense of elections.

Other minor but yet important questions are sure to crop up for discussion from time to time. That often threatened but as often escaping culprit, the Corporation of the City of London, with all its charitable abuses, its sham reforms, and its wholesale manufacture of votes, can only be dealt with by a Parliament when a strong and earnest majority exists, willing to exercise its power in sweeping out an Augean stable. Then there is the question of water supply, of which the late Government, dropping one word of the old quotation, may well say—

‘ medio de fonte . . .
Surgit amari aliquid.’

This question must be dealt with; so, probably, must the question of metropolitan gas, as well as a larger question than either, and one which may include them both—metropolitan government. There are other social questions which will require attention. Some reform of the law of patronage in the Church of England is urgently demanded; for, although an improved public opinion has done much to lessen the evils and diminish the scandals of ecclesiastical bargaining, much still remains to be done, and all true friends of the Church of England will rejoice to see some effort made in this direction.

It is, however, altogether premature to discuss the legislative measures of a Government not yet in existence; and indeed the advanced season of the year at which the new Parliament will enter upon its functions leaves a space of time barely sufficient for the transaction of the necessary financial business of the Session and the renewal of two or three expiring Acts. Not so, however, does it stand with the relations of the Crown to foreign Powers, and to the occurrences which may at any moment arise in Europe or in Asia. There the action of the Government is incessant, and although the legislative functions of the State may very well be suspended for a few months, its administrative duties will demand immediate attention. We therefore feel called upon to say a few words on this subject, and the more so as in some foreign countries great delusions appear to prevail upon it. We are anxious to state with the full force of conviction (what indeed has been already declared by Lord Hartington and even by

Mr. Gladstone in their electoral speeches), that a change of government in England, however complete, does not imply, and will not cause, any abrupt revulsion in the foreign policy of this country. The existing engagements of the Crown of England are independent of ministerial changes, and will be scrupulously supported and upheld, whoever may be in power. It happens fortunately that no foreign question of flagrant and urgent importance is at this moment open. 'Not Heaven itself upon the past has power;' the future alone can be dealt with as occasion or the policy of the new Cabinet may prescribe. In spite of Lord Beaconsfield's sinister and ominous predictions, we believe that the crisis in European affairs, in which he took an active share, is now closed; and that although no doubt the horizon is charged with clouds, if not with storms, no pressing danger threatens the peace and tranquillity of Europe. We were assured in the Speech from the Throne, delivered in February, that her Majesty's relations with all the Powers were friendly, and we believe it. It may well happen that the relations of this country with Russia, which have been of late severely strained, will be favourably affected, partly by the removal of Prince Gortschakoff from the conduct of affairs, and partly by the change of government in England. If that be the case, we shall sincerely rejoice at this improvement; for it is obviously much more desirable that England and Russia should come to an amicable understanding, provided it be an honest one, than that they should carry on a clandestine warfare in Central Asia or elsewhere. But this result can only be obtained by a frank and sincere renunciation on the part of Russia of aggressive and hostile schemes directed against her immediate neighbours, and indirectly against the interests and rights of Great Britain. The Russians are entirely mistaken if they expect to find in the Liberal Ministry now about to enter upon office any encouragement whatever to the aggressive and ambitious designs of the Pan Slavonic party, which would encounter a firm resistance in Germany, and not in Germany alone, and which could scarcely fail to rekindle the half-extinguished conflagration of the Eastern world. The first principle of the Liberal Government is the maintenance of peace; and peace can only be maintained by vigilant self-control on all hands, by the union of the great Powers, and by a firm resolution to oppose the intrigues or the violence of any separate State. The new Ministry will enter upon office without the slightest feeling of hostility, or even coolness, towards any foreign nation; and if it leans on no exclusive alliance, it has

certainly no disposition to repel the cordial sympathy and co-operation of any foreign government.

So lately as in January of this year, a contemporary, whose literary merits we should be the last to disparage, employed many pages in discussing, and in his own view, no doubt, disposing summarily of, 'the credentials of the Opposition.' Credentials, according to Dr. Johnson, are 'that which gives a title to credit, the warrant upon which belief or authority is claimed.' Now, shortly, the warrant upon which those who, while we write, are still the Opposition, claim authority, is the fact that they have won upwards of 130 seats in the new Parliament, and that the Liberal votes given in the contested elections outnumber the Tory votes about in the proportion of 4 to 3. We are not, therefore, very careful to answer our Quarterly contemporary, as facts, which are the strongest arguments, have answered him already. It is amusing, however, to look down the pages to which we have referred, and see how at other places besides Elton,

'Regardless of their doom,
The little victims play;
No sense have they of ills to come,
Nor care beyond to-day.'

Take the following as an example of accurate foresight, remembering that it was published only a few weeks before the dissolution :—

'So long as the legitimate duration of Parliaments is seven years, it would seem to be more deferential to the laws of the realm not to dissolve before the natural term of its existence a House of Commons which energetically assists the Government, and *which is asserted to misrepresent the sense of the constituent body only by a speculative minority.*'

But the leader of the party, not so 'deferential to the laws of the realm' as our contemporary would have had him, 'on the 8th day of March, 1880'—to use, with an altered date, our contemporary's own words as applied to the election of 1874—'suddenly sprang a mine upon Parliament and the country,' with the intention of driving back afresh 'the advancing lines of his rival; though, when the smoke had cleared away, it appeared that he had blown his own army into the air.'

Exactly so; and we may go on to observe, in the words of the article we are quoting : *—

'Lord Beaconsfield's passion for surprises is a favourite theme with Liberal orators; and they have repeated the reproach so often, that perhaps by this time they have begun to believe it.'

* Quarterly Review, January, 1880, art. viii.

Have they not good reason for the belief?

‘But there certainly would have been ground for astonishment, at least for the ordinary mind, had Lord Beaconsfield, while firmly entrenched in power, wantonly sallied into the open to fight a gratuitous engagement with assailants who had repeatedly demonstrated their incapacity to dislodge him; nor would the sense of amazement have been lessened by the recollection that this novel strategy was resorted to by his predecessor, with the result, as described at the time by an indignant follower [Mr. Bouverie], of having at one blow destroyed both his administration and himself; and they are both wiped out of existence.’

The fact is that if Mr. Gladstone committed an error by his sudden and ill-advised dissolution in 1874, the dissolution of Parliament by Lord Beaconsfield, at Easter 1880, has been equally productive of unforeseen results, and equally fatal to its authors. In the latter case, however, it could not have been long delayed; and it is now clear that, without knowing it, the Ministry had lost the confidence of the country. The love of change and the depression of trade and agriculture had probably much to do with the result; but it is well to bear in mind that the more democratic our constitution becomes, the more are we exposed to sudden and vehement changes of popular sentiment, which now controls the tenure of power.

We have but one more consideration to submit to our readers. It forms the moral of countless tales; it is a sentiment which runs, in varied shapes, through the folk-lore and the proverbs of many nations. It is embodied in the story of Jephthah's daughter and of Polycrates's ring. In times of great prosperity beware of a reverse. Propitiate by any sacrifice the powers of evil. But what are we to do? Not sacrifice our leaders on the altar of Nemesis, or cast away our principles to appease the Fates. No, but this at all events we may do as a party. We may be humble and self-possessed in prosperity, as we have, we trust, been cheerful and hopeful in adversity; and while we use to the best advantage the power which the new Parliament has given us, we may take care to use it with courtesy and consideration towards our opponents, and with watchfulness and control over ourselves.

INDEX.

A

Agricultural crisis, the, 1—present condition of labourer and farmer, 3—extent and causes of the depression, 1—foreign competition, 8—the American wheat-fields, 10—and export cattle and meat trade, 13—British system of farming, 14—the small proprietorship scheme, 16—the land laws and their results, 22—proposed reforms, 26—transfer of land, 27—improvement of land, 29—farm tenures, 33—compensation for unexhausted improvements, 35—future of British agriculture, 38.

Anne, Queen, review of Dr. Burton's History of the Reign of, 512—the war with France, 515—Marlborough's soldiers, 518—character of Marlborough, 519—Malplaquet, 521—the Hague and Gertruydenberg Conferences, 522—hatred of Marlborough explained, 524—Admiral Benbow and the mutinous captains, 526—the great storm, 528—ravages committed by French ships in the Channel, 529—course of the war in Spain, 531—prosecution of Sacheverell, 533—downfall of Godolphin's administration, 535—affair of the ' Worcester,' 537—the union with Scotland, 539—secret negotiations for peace, 541—expedition to Quebec, 542—fall of Marlborough, 544—peace of Utrecht, 545.

B

Boulger, Demetrius, review of his work on England and Russia in Central Asia, 68—his Life of Yakoub Beg, 376.

Brodrick. See *Whigs*.

C

Caird, J., his 'Landed Interest' reviewed, 1.

Charlemagne, Mr. Mullinger's essay on the schools of, reviewed, 380—course of learning in Gaul anterior to the Carolingian epoch, 381—the monk of St. Gall's account of Charlemagne's regard for letters, 402—the Palace School, 405—Alcuin's educational work at Tours, 407.

Clifford, Professor, review of Messrs. Stephen and Pollock's edition of his Lectures and Essays, 474—sketch of his life, 477—his character, 479—how his opinions formed themselves, 480—analysis of his philosophical system, 487—his physical creed, 488—his metaphysical creed, 490—consciousness, 491—will, 496—the historical element in his system, 497—critical examination of his method, 502—his account of the Reformation in England, 510.

E

Election, general, changes produced by the, in the personal composition of Parliament, 548—local alterations of the balance of parties, 551—numerical analysis of the old and the new Parliaments, 552—character of the late Parliament, 554—the Tories' accusation of corrupt expenditure, 555—their exaggerated view of Liberal differences, 556—Cabinet-making powers of the two parties, 558—probable course of legislation, 559—effect of change of government on foreign policy, 562.

England and Russia in Central Asia, Mr. Boulger's work on, reviewed, 68—recent Russian conquests, 70—the supposed danger to India, 74—difficulties in the way of an expedition from the Caucasus, 76—new Russian stations on the Eastern shore of the Caspian, 81—the expedition against the Turcomans, 84—Merv, 86—Herat, 87—our strength in India, 88—possibilities of an invasion, 90—the frontier question, 92.

F

Franklin, Benjamin, review of Mr. Bigelow's life of, 321—Franklin's rise to power, 321—his Militia Bill, 322—his mission to England in 1757, 323—and again in 1763, 324—his theory of colonial rule, 325—political condition in which he found England, 326—his baiting in the Privy Council Chamber, 329—his mission to the French Court, 333—negotiation for the cession of Canada to the United States, 334—his feeling against England, 339—his character and habits, 342—his friendships, 346—happy course of his life, 347—his kindness and benevolence, 349—his literary ability, 351—his scientific spirit, 351—facts relating to the publication of his writings, 355.

G

Giffen, R., his 'Essays on Finance' reviewed, 257.

Gilbert, J. T., his 'Irish Contemporary History from 1611 to 1652' reviewed, 347.

H

Hamley, General, on the Indian frontier question, 95.

Horse-racing, review of books by Mr. Day and others relating to, 411—turf statistics of 1879, 412—yearlings, 415—trainers, 416—jockeys, 419—officials of race meetings, 422—the tout, 425—Newmarket and the Jockey Club, 427—gambling, 429—bookmakers, 433—suggested reforms, 434.

I

Ireland, Mr. Sullivan's work on, reviewed, 99—the demand for rents by arbitration and fixity of tenure, 101—the peasant proprietary scheme, 106—character of the agitation, 111—the distress and the farmers, 117—the true Reform policy for Ireland, 120—the Land Act, 121—emigration, 122—relief works, 124—the Surplus Fund and the educational and religious questions, 128—the Grand Jury system, 135—proposed establishment of local boards, 137—reflections on the recent agitation, 138.

Ireland during the period from 1641 to 1648, review of works treating of, 437—outbreak of the rebellion, 440—organisation of the confederacy, 448—the truce of 1643, 451—the expedition into Scotland, 452—Belling's mission to the Pope, 453—Rinuccini appointed nuncio, his secret instructions, 454—his reception in Ireland, 458—Glamorgan's negotiations with the Confederates, 458—conditions of a proposed treaty between Charles and the Papal Court, 460—Sir Kenelm Digby, 461—action of the clergy against the treaty with Ormonde, 462—defiance of the nuncio's authority, 468—character of Rinuccini, 471—Ormonde, 471—Owen Roe O'Neill, 472.

L

Lighthouses, Mr. Findlay's work relating to, reviewed, 172—statistics of British coast lights, 173—the Pharos of Alexandria and its alleged range of light, 173—ancient lighthouses, 175—the Tour de Corduan, 176—history of the Eddystone lighthouse, 176—the Bell Rock lighthouse, 180—the Skerryvore lighthouse, 184—the Wolf Rock lighthouse, 187—the Great Bass Rock lighthouse, 189—general principles of lighthouse construction, 190—systems of lighting, 193—modes of producing the light, 198—the electric light, 199—distinctions of illumination, 200—maintenance of sea lights, how provided, 202—Sir William Thomson's suggestions for the improvement of our lighthouse system, 205.

M

Minto, Lord, his Life and Letters while Governor-General of India, reviewed, 228—sketch of his life prior to his arrival at Calcutta, 228—first impressions, 231—defeats French influence in Persia, 233—the missions to Runjit Singh and the King of Cabul, 235—operations against the dacoits, 237—his suppression of the mutiny in the Madras army, 238—capture of Bourbon and the Mauritius, 242—expedition against Java, 243—official neglect, 247—his letters home, 249—his financial policy, 250—his views concerning the balance of power among the States of India, 252—his recall, 253—illness and death, 256.

Mohammedanism in China, review of works by M. de Thiersant and other authors relating to, 359—introduction of Islam into China, 361—the Emperor Suh-tsung's alliance with the Khalif of Baghdad, 363—description of the Chinese Muslims, 364—quarrels between them and the Confucians, 370—the rebellion in Yun-nan, 372—Eastern Turkestan and its reconquest by the Chinese, 376—influence of Mohammedanism on the future of China, 378.

Moran, Bishop, his 'Spicilegium Ossoriense' reviewed, 440.

P

Parliament, the new. See *Election*.

Persian Miracle Play, review of Sir L. Pelly's and Mr. Wollaston's edition of the, 141—story of the house of 'Ali, 144—its legendary

treatment by the Shi'a, 147—the festival of Moharram, 150—stage preparations, 151—scenes of the play, 159—burial of the *tábút*, 169. *Pusey, Dr.*, his edition of the Abbé Gaume's 'Mañuá' for Confessors' reviewed, 281.

R

Ritualism, review of manuals, &c., relating to, 281—origin of the movement, 282—difficulties attending the investigation of Ritualistic teaching, 283—the Eucharist or 'Sacrament of the Altar,' and its identity with the Mass, 284—non-communicating attendance for the purpose of sacrificial worship and adoration, 293—obligation of fasting communion, 302—sacramental confession and absolution, 304—observance of unauthorised festivals and superstitious customs, 311—invocation of saints and angels, 315—hymnology, 317—misconception on which Ritualism is based, 319—its object, 320.

Russia before and after the War, Mr. Fairfax Taylor's translation of, reviewed, 206—Michael Bakunin, the type of the Nihilist party, 208—leading tenets of the sect, 211—their spread among the people, 212—the Nationalist party, 215—Prince Tcherkasski, its typical representative, 217—his administration of Bulgaria during the occupation, 218—force of the popular will in producing the war, 222—impression produced by the action of the British fleet, 224—the Austro-German alliance, 226.

S

Shipley, Rev. Orby, his 'Ritual of the Altar' reviewed, 281.

Stevenson, Robert, Life of, reviewed, 172.

T

Turner, Mr. Hamerton's Life of, reviewed, 40—a true view of Turner's career, 42—his intellectual capacity, 45—his accuracy in the portraiture of objects tested, 52—'Heidelberg,' 52—'Kilchurn Castle,' 53—'Crossing the Brook,' 55—'Phryne going to the Baths as Venus,' 57—the 'Old Téméraire,' 58—Turner's experiments with pigments, 60—real merit of his works, 60—his mastery of water-colour, 63—relation of art and nature in painting, 65—character of Turner, 67.

W

Whigs, the, as a section of the Liberal party, 257—Mr. Brodrick's defence of Whig principles, 260—the 'Quarterly' Reviewer's misrepresentations, 263—programme of the Liberal party, 265—Whig principles with regard to the laws for the defence of life and property, 267—the preservation of the Constitution, 262—the maintenance of the Church, 269—the duty of combatting popular delusions, 271—commercial policy, 272—financial administration, 275—the Irish question, 276—and the maintenance of the authority of Parliament, 278.

